
IMPRIMATUR.

Dec. 1 Decemb.
1678,

H. LONDON.

IMPRIMATUR.

Dec. 1 Decemb.
1678,

H. LONDON.

POPERY:
OR, THE
Principles & Positions
Approved by the
CHURCH
OF
ROME

(When Really Believ'd and Practis'd)

Are very Dangerous to all; and to Protestant
Kings and Supreme Powers, more especially
Pernicious:

And Inconsistent with that Loyalty, which (by the Law
of NATURE and SCRIPTURE) is Indispensably
due to SUPREME POWERS.

In a LETTER to a Person of Honor;

By T. L^d Bishop of LINCOLN.

Rev. 18. 4. Jer. 15. 6.

*Come out of her my people, lest ye be partakers of her Sins and
Plagues.*

In the SAVOY:

Printed by Tho. Newcomb, for James Collins in the
Temple-passage from Essex-street. MDCCLXXIX.

Е М О Я

Are very Dangerous to all; and to Persons
Aged and infirm; more especially
Persons;

the SUPREMACY POWERS
of NATIONS and MEMBERS
and INCOME TAXES AND TAXES (by 1917)

to the effect that the

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO


Printed by The Standard Press, New York

FOR MY

Honored Friend

L. N. P.

SIR,



Received and read your Letter, and this comes to (bring my humble Service, and) tell you so. In your Letter you tell me, *First*; Of an Inhumane and Bloody Design and Popish Plot, a Traiterous and Roman-Catholick Conspiracy (as you call it) against the Sacred Person and Life of our Gracious KING, (whom GOD preserve) and many more (by them) design'd for Ruine, and for the Subversion of the true Religion Establish'd by Law, and introducing Papal Tyranny, Superstition and Idolatry. A Design not only Unchristian, but Inhumane and Barbarous; beyond all examples of Turkish or Pagan Cruelty; nor has it (in any

B

story)

(a) Nuptie Parisinæ & Laniena Protestantium in Gallia, Anno 1572. Vide Thuanum, ad dictum Annum.

(b) In an Almanack commonly sold, since His Majesties Happy Return; call'd, *Calendarium Catholicum*; the Gunpowder-Treason is call'd, *Cecil's Conrivance*. It was printed 1662.

(c) The aforesaid Popish *Calendarium Catholicum*, OF Catholic Almanack, at the end of it, about Holy-days set apart by Act of Parliament.

story) any parallel Impiety; unless perhaps, that Bloody (a) *French Massacre*, or the *Gunpowder-Treason*; all contriv'd and carry'd on, by Men of the same desperate Principles, and (though with the blood and ruine of many thousand innocent persons) to advance the Papal Interest. Secondly, You say, That the Popish Party decry this Impious Conspiracy, as a State-Trick (without truth or reality) to make Catholicks (as they commonly miscall themselves) odious to the People, and this whole Nation. This I believe (and know) they do. As their Plots and Conspiracies, so their Impudence to deny or lessen them, (when discover'd) is monstrous, and (were not their Persons and Principles known) incredible. So they did, (where, and when they durst) and still do (b) call the *Gunpowder-Treason*, A State-Design, to make them (though they were innocent) seem guilty, and Criminals. Thirdly, Lastly, you say, that several Papists tell you, (in excuse of Popery, and their Party) That if indeed there be such a Plot and Conspiracy, (as is pretended) yet it is the only fault of those persons concern'd in it; not of Popery, or their Religion; the Principles and Doctrine of their Church, giving no ground or encouragement to such impious and Anti-Monarchical practices. This I believe too; because I find them making the same Apology for themselves, to take off the guilt of the *Gunpowder-Treason*. For (without all truth or modesty) they tell us in Print (c) That the *Gunpowder-Treason* was MORE THAN SUSPECTED, to be the CONTRIVANCE of Cecil, the great Bulli-

an; TO RENDER CATHOLICKS ODIOUS; and that there were but VERY FEW of that Religion, (AND THOSE DESPERADOES TOO) detected of it, &c. All (d) sober Catholicks detesting that, and all such Conspiracies.

Now these things premis'd, you desire to know of me, whether I think these their Allegations and Apologies true; or if I think them untrue and insignificant (as you may be sure I do) that I would give you some reasons why I do so. In obedience therefore to your command, and to satisfy that Obligation that lies upon me (so far as I am able) to Vindicate Truth, and my Mother the Church of England; (though I have little time, and few Books here (being absent from my own) save what I borrow of friends) I shall endeavour to say something, which may (I hope) be pertinent, towards the conviction of our Adversaries, and your satisfaction. And here, I shall plainly set down,

(d) And yet Ribadineira, Bzovius, &c. reckon these Gunpowder Traitors amongst the eminent Martyrs for their Church and Religion; as you shall see anon. And Father Parsons calls Garnet (Executed for High Treason, and the Gunpowder Conspiracy)..... An Innocent Man, who suffer'd Unjustly; that he lived a SAINTS Life, and accomplish'd the same with an HAPPY DEATH, dying in DEFENCE of JUSTICE. In his Book against the Oath of Allegiance; call'd, A Discussion of the Answer of Dr. William Barlow, &c. p. 22, 23.

I. The Position I undertake to make good.

II. The Proofs and Reasons of it.

I. The Position is this The Doctrine and Principles of Popery, own'd by the Church of Rome (when believed and practis'd) are not onely dangerous, but pernicious to Kings, (especially to those who are Protestants) prejudicial to the just rights of Monarchy, and inconsistent with that Loyalty, which (by the Laws of Nature and Scripture) is due to them; and particularly to our Kings, by the establish'd and known Laws of England, made antiently, even by Popish

Kings and Parliaments, against Papal Usurpations, and Anti-Monarchical Practices. And here (because it is impossible distinctly to shew, how Popish Principles are dangerous to our Kings, and prejudicial to their Just Rights, and Royal Prerogative; unless we first know, what that Prerogative, and those Rights are) I shall inquire,

1. What the *Jura Corona*, the Rights and Prerogatives of the Imperial Crown of *England* are, as to our present concern.
2. How Popish Doctrines and Principles, may be dangerous, or pernicious to them.

1. For the *First*; That *England* is a *Monarchy*, the *Crown Imperial*, and our Kings *SUPREME* Governors, and *SOLE SUPREME* Governors of this Realm, and all other their Dominions, will (I believe, I am sure it should) be granted; seeing our Authentick Laws and Statutes do so expressly, and so often say it. In our Oath of Supremacy we Swear, that the King is, the *ONLY SUPREME Governor. SUPREME*, so none (not the Pope) above Him: and *ONLY SUPREME*; so none co-ordinate, or equal to Him. So that by our known Laws, our King is, *Solo Deo minor*, invested with such a Supremacy, as excludes both Pope and People (and all the World, God Almighty only excepted, by whom Kings Reign) from having any Power, Jurisdiction, or Authority over Him. For this

this *Sovereignty* and *Supremacy* belonging to our Kings, and the Imperial Crown of *England* is asserted, not only by the Statutes of (e) *Q. Elizabeth*, (f) *King James*, and (g) *Charles the Second*, (Protestant Princes) but even those Statutes made by Popish Princes and Parliaments, declare the same: I instance only in (h) *Richard the Second*, (i) *Henry the Eighth*, and (k) *Q. Mary*, (though all the Statutes of Provisors, were pertinent to this purpose.) That *Richard the Second* and His Parliament were Roman-Catholicks, is manifest; and it is as certain, That *Henry the Eighth* and His Parliaments (when the Statutes cited were made) were so too. For 'tis evident, that those Statutes were made *Anno. 24. and Anno. 25. Hen. 8.* that is, *Anno. Dom. 1532. and 1533.* when neither He, nor His Adherents, were Excommunicate, but actual Members of the Roman Church then, and for some years after. For though Pope *Paul the Third* was angry, and about it, *Anno. 1535.* yet he did not actually Excommunicate him or his Adherents, before the year (l) 1538. which was six years after *Henry the Eighth*, and His Popish Parliament had Vindicated the Rights of the Imperial Crown of *England*, against the irrational and unjust Pretences and Usurpations of the Pope; and declared, that the *Supremacy* (both in Ecclesiastical and Civil Things) ever did (*de Jure*) belong to the Imperial Crown of *England*, not to the Pope's Mitre: He having no more to do in *England*, (*Jure proprio*, or by any Law of God or Man) than *Henry the Eighth* in *Italy*. And that Parliament of Queen *Mary*, (cited in the Margent) although a Popish Parliament,

(e) Vid. Stat. 1. Eliz. cap. 1. 5. Eliz. cap. 1. & 13. Eliz. cap. 2.

(f) Vid. 1. Jac. cap. 7. & 3. Jac. cap. 4.

(g) Vid. 12. Car. 2. cap. 30. In the Preamble.

(h) Statut. 16. Rich. 2. cap. 5.

(i) Statut. 24. Hen. 8. cap. 12. & 25. Hen. 8. cap. 19. & 37. Hen. 8. cap. 17. & 26. Hen. 8. cap. 1.

(k) Parliamentum secundum 2. Mariz, cap. 1.

(l) The Bull by which *Hen. 8.* was Excommunicate, was Dat. Romæ 16. Cal. Januarii, Pauli Pape 3. Anno 5. Vid. Bullarium Cherubini, Tom. 1. pag. 704 Edit. Lugdun. 1655.

Parliament, yet declares fully for the Queen's Supremacy, (which, to some may seem strange) for that Act expressly says, 1. That the **IMPERIAL CROWN** of this Realm, with all its Prerogatives, Jurisdictions, &c. was descended to the Queen. 2. That she was the **SOVEREIGN and SUPREME** Governor of all Her Dominions, in **AS FULL, LARGE, and AMPLE MANNER, AS ANY OF HER PREDECESSORS**, (therefore in as ample a manner as Her Father Henry the Eighth.) 3. That by the **MOST ANCIENT LAWS** of this Realm, the punishment of **ALL OFFENDERS**, against the Regality and Laws of this Realm, belong'd to the King, &c. So that even a Popish Parliament acknowledges and declares, the Kings of England possess'd of such a Supremacy, over all Persons, and that by our **MOST ANCIENT LAWS**, that He may punish **ALL OFFENDERS** (Clergy or Laity) against the Laws, and His Regality. (How contradictory to this, the Trent Council and the Doctrine of the Roman Church is, you shall see anon.) But for the Supremacy of the Kings of England, (according to our *Ancient and Later Laws*, I refer you to the (m) Learned in those Laws; who will give you a clear Declaration of this Supremacy, and a just Vindication of it, from those impertinent (and seditious) Objections brought against it by some, who, inflav'd to Rome, have cast off Loyalty to their King, and Love to their Country.

And lastly, As for the Supremacy of Kings, (so far as it concerns the Laws of God, (Natural or Positive) and Divines to determine it) I refer you

to

(m) Vid. Coke's Reports, Part. 5. de Jure Regis Ecclesiastico; and Calvin's Case, 7. Report; Sir John Davis his Reports, in the Case of Praemunire, &c.

to the Answer of the (n) University of Oxon. in a Letter of Henry the Eighth, requiring their Judgement in that Point: To the (o) Articles of Edward the Sixth: Of Queen (p) Elizabeth: The Articles (q) of Ireland: The (r) Injunctions of Elizabeth: The (s) Canons of J. Jacobs: And the (t) Canon (sub Carolo Martyra) 1640 (besides the Writings of many particular Learned Men :) In which you may see the Judgement of the Church of England, concerning Supremacy, and the Loyalty due to our King, clearly and fully express'd: and (in the late unhappy Rebellion) more truly profess'd and practic'd by Her Sons, than Papist, Presbyter, or Fanatique (though some of them vainly brag of their Loyalty) can, with any just reason pretend to. If you desire further satisfaction and evidence, for the Supremacy of Kings, (particularly of our Kings, and the Roman Emperours) even in Ecclesiastical Matters: you know, and (at your leisure) may consult, the Collections of our (u) Saxon, and the (w) Imperial Laws; where you may have sufficient and abundant evidence, that (as to matter of Fact, never questioned in those days) those Emperours and Kings, made many Laws and Constitutions, in Ecclesiastical Matters, (which concern'd the Church) as well as Civil, (which concern'd the State.) And (if you desire it) I can shew you, an Original MS. (agreed upon, and approved by the Convocations of both Provinces, (Canterbury and York) and subscribed by both Archbishops, and several of each Province) wherein it is clearly shewn, (so far as Scripture, and other Records of those times mention

(n) Vid. Literas Acad. Oxon. Hen. 8. Dat. 27. Jul. 1534.

(o) Art. Ed. 6. 1552. Art. 36.

(p) Art. 5. Eliz. 1562. Art. 37.

(q) Articuli Hibernie, 1615: Sect. 57.

(r) Editz 1559. in calce post Injunctionem, 53.

(s) Canones, 1603. Can. 1. 2.

(t) Can. 1640. Can. 1. &c.

(u) See our Saxon Laws by Mr. Lambert, Spelman Concil. Tom. 7. Whelocus, &c.

(w) Vid. Cod. Theodosianum, cum Doctiss. Gothofred. Notis, & Cod. & Novellas Constitut. Justiniani.

Parliament, yet declares fully for the Queen's Supremacy, (which, to some may seem strange) for that Act expressly says, 1. That the IMPERIAL CROWN of this Realm, with all its Prerogatives, Jurisdictions, &c. was descended to the Queen. 2. That she was the SOVEREIGN and SUPREME Governor of all Her Dominions, in AS FULL, LARGE, and AMPLE MANNER, AS ANY OF HER PROGENITORS, (therefore in as ample a manner as Her Father Henry the Eighth.) 3. That by the MOST ANCIENT LAWS of this Realm, the punishment of ALL OFFENDERS, against the Regality and Laws of this Realm, belong'd to the King, &c. So that even a Popish Parliament acknowledges and declares, the Kings of England possess'd of such a Supremacy, over all Persons, and that by our MOST ANCIENT LAWS, that He may punish ALL OFFENDERS (Clergy or Laity) against the Laws, and His Regality. (How contradictory to this, the Trent Council and the Doctrine of the Roman Church is, you shall see anon.) But for the Supremacy of the Kings of England, (according to our Ancient and Later Laws, I refer you to the (m) Learned in those Laws; who will give you a clear Declaration of this Supremacy, and a just Vindication of it, from those impertinent (and seditious) Objections brought against it by some, who, inflav'd to Rome, have cast off Loyalty to their King, and Love to their Country.

And lastly, As for the Supremacy of Kings, (so far as it concerns the Laws of God, (Natural or Positive) and Divines to determine it) I refer you to

(m) Vid. Coke's Reports, Part. 5. de Jure Regis Ecclesiastico; and Calvin's Case, 7. Report; Sir John Davis his Reports, in the Case of Praemunire, &c.

to the *Answer of the (n) University of Oxon.* in a Letter of Henry the Eighth, requiring their Judgement in that Point: To the (a) *Articles of Edward the Sixth*; Of Queen (p) *Elizabeth*; The *Articles* (q) of Ireland; The (r) *Injunctions of Elizabeth*; The (s) *Canons of Jacobi*; And the (t) *Canons* (sub *Carolo Martyro*) 1640. (besides the Writings of many particular Learned Men :) In which you may see the Judgement of the Church of England, concerning Supremacy, and the Loyalty due to our King, clearly and fully express'd: and (in the late unhappy Rebellion) more truly profess'd and practic'd by Her Sons, than Papist, Presbyter, or Fanatic (though some of them vainly brag of their Loyalty) can, with any just reason pretend to. If you desire further satisfaction and evidence, for the Supremacy of Kings, (particularly of our Kings, and the Roman Emperors) even in Ecclesiastical Matters; you know, and (at your leisure) may consult, the Collections of our (u) *Saxon*, and the (w) *Imperial Laws*; where you may have sufficient and abundant evidence, that (as to matter of Fact, never questioned in those days) those Emperours and Kings, made many Laws and Constitutions, in Ecclesiastical Matters, (which concern'd the Church) as well as Civil, (which concern'd the State.) And (if you desire it) I can shew you, an Original MS. (agreed upon, and approved by the Convocations of both Provinces, (Canterbury and York) and subscribed by both Archbishops, and several of each Province) wherein it is clearly shewn, (so far as Scripture, and other Records of those times mention

(n) Vid. Literas Acad. Oxon. Hen. 8. Dat. 27. Jul. 1534.

(o) Art. Ed. 6. 1552. Art. 36.

(p) Art. 5. Eliz. 1562. Art. 37.

(q) Articuli Hiberniz, 1615. Sect. 57.

(r) Editz 1559. in calce post Injunctionem, 53.

(s) Canones, 1603. Can. 1. 2.

(t) Can. 1640. Can. 1. &c.

(u) See our Saxon Laws by Mr. Lambert, Spelman Concil. Tom. 7. Whelocus, &c.

(w) Vid. Cod. Theodosianum, cum Doctiss. Gothofred. Notis, & Cod. & Novellas Constitut. Justinianj.

tion them) that Kings (from the beginning of the World, till our Blessed Saviours time) did, and *de Jure*, might exercise an Ecclesiastical, as well as Civil Jurisdiction and Supremacy; especially the Kings of the Jews, his own People; which Monarchy was of Gods own (and particularly Divine) Institution. These things premisd, I come now to shew you, (in the second place) how dangerous, and (when, and where they have power to put them in execution) how pernicious Popish Principles are, to the Persons of Kings, and their just Rights and Prerogatives. And here, I say,

I. That many of their *Popish Principles*, and generally approved and received *Doctrines*, are not only dangerous, but destructive to, and inconsistent with the just Sovereignty and Supremacy of Kings. Because they generally say, and (in a thousand Books writ to that purpose) industriously endeavor to prove it, That all Kings and Emperors, are so far from being Supreme, that they are Subject to the Pope, as to their Superior Lord, to whom they owe Service and Fidelity. That this may appear, consider,

I. The Emperor, (x) when he comes into the Popes presence, as soon as ever he sees him, he must (His Hat off, and bare-headed) bow, till his Knee touch the ground, and worship the Pope; and coming nearer, must bow again; and when he comes to the Pope, he must bow a third time, and *DEVOUTLY Kiss the Popes Foot*. The Emperor must *WORSHIP* the Pope, with the Incurvations, or bowings of Body, even to the ground; and then (bare-headed,

(x) *Caesar, ut primum Pontificem videt, illum DETECTO CAPITE, genu TERRAM TANGENS VENERATUR: Et iterum cum appropinquet ad gradus sedis Papae, genu flectit; ac demum cum ad Pontificis pedes pervenerit, illos DEVOTE osculatur: Sacrarum Ceremoniarum Rom. Ecclesiae, Lib. 1. Tit. 5. pag. 22. Col. 3. Edit. onis Rom. Anno 1560.*

headed, and on his Knees) **DEVOUTLY** Kifs the Pope's Foot. Execrable and prodigious Pride! The Pope (without all truth or probability) vainly and ridiculously, only pretends to be Christ's Vicar, and so, (if it were true) is less than his Master; and yet our blessed Saviour never requir'd, nor had such Adorations, Incurvations, or Kissings of his Toe, of any, much less of Kings or Emperors. Nor would any Man require such, but the (y) *Man of Sin*; who *exalts himself* (takes that greatness which God never gave him) *above all that is call'd God, or worshipped*: That is, above all *Kings and Emperors*. Well, but does not the Pope (in this Case) shew some respect and civility to the Emperor? Does he not uncover his head, or bow his body, &c. No; for the same Authentick Book, of the **SACRED Ceremonies**, of the **HOLT Roman Church**, tells us (x).... *That the Pope never gives any reverence, to any MORTAL whomsoever, either by rising up apparently, or by uncovering, or bowing his head. Onely* (sayes that Ceremonial) *when the Emperor has kiss'd the Foot of the Pope, sitting in his Chair, he riseth up, A VERY LITTLE to him; and so he does sometimes to GREAT PRINCES*. Whether this can stand with that Supremacy, which (by Divine Law, Natural and Positive) is due to Kings, to be so far subject, and slaves to the Pope; let Kings (who are most concern'd) and the World Judge. And it is to be consider'd, that the Book I cite for those passages concerning the Pope, is no *Apocryphal*, or *Non-licenc'd Pamphlet*, containing the inventions of some private person; but it contains the **SACRED Ceremonies** of

(y) 2 Thess. 2. Vers. 3, 4.

(x) Pontifex Romanus NE-
MINI omnino mortalium, re-
verentiam facit, assurgendo ma-
nifeste, caput inclinando, aut de-
tendendo. Romano autem Impe-
ratori, postquam illum SEDENS
ad osculum pedis suscepit. ALI-
QUANTULUM assurgit Mag-
nis etiam Principibus. PRIVA-
TIM adventantibus, cum NON
EST in PONTIFICALIBUS,
aliquantulum assurgit TAN-
QUAM reverentiam faciens,
&c. dictus Liber Sacrar. Ce-
remon. Lib. 3. Pag. 113.
Col. 2.

the ROMAN CHURCH, collected by Marcellus ARCHBISHOP of Corcyra, dedicated to POPE LEO the Tenth, printed at ROME, and highly approved, and (a) commended by their eminent Writers.

(a) Liber VALDE PROBATUS, says Possevin: In Apparatu sacro; in Christ. Marcello.

(b) He must execute *Stryatoris Officium* (be Yeoman of the Stirrup) says Card. Baronius. Annal. Tom. 12. ad An. 1177. Sect. 38.

(c) *Disco Sacrarum Cere- moniarum*, lib. 1. Tit. 5. p. 26. Col. 3.

(d) Tho. Walsingham, Hypo- dig. Neufstriz, p. 588.

(e) Baronius Annal. Tom. 12. ad Annum 1177. Sect. 124.

(f) *Ibidem* Annal. Tom. 12. ad Annum 1155. num. 13, 14.

(g) *Ibid.* num. 13.

(h) *Ibid.* num. 14.

2. But this is not all; the poor Emperor must do (the Pope) his great Superior and Master, more service, and be his Groom, or (at best) Gentleman (b) of his Horse. He must hold the Popes Stirrup till he get on Horseback, and then lead the Horse for some paces (c) *Cæsar (traditis sceptro & pomo, uni ex suis) prævenit ad equum Pontificis, & TENET STAPHAM, quoad Pontifex equum ascenderit; & deinde accepto equi freno, per aliquot passus ducit equum Pontificis:* and the Emperors have (de facto) executed this mean Office (which was impious and prodigious pride in the Pope, requiring or permitting; and degenerate in the Emperors, in performing it :) So the Emperor (d) Sigismund held the Stirrup of Pope Martin the Fifth. And the Emperor (e) Frederick, of Alexander the Third, &c. And the same Frederick had done the same to Pope Adrian the Fourth (if (f) Baronius say true) *In conspectu exercitus sui, Fredericus OFFICIUM STRATORIS cum FUCUNDITATE implevit, & strenuam FORTITER tenuit.* And, that it might be remem- ber'd, Baronius has put this Note in the (g) Mar- gent *Ut Reges & Imperatores INSERVANT. PAPÆ.* And in the Margent of the next Paragraph *Rex implet (h) munus STRATORIS Papæ.*

3. Nor is this all; the Emperor must Swear Fe- alty to the Pope; and that he will be his Proctor, to defend and maintain all his Rights and Honors, &c.

&c. In this form (i)....*Ego Rex Romanorum futurus Imperator, promitto & juro me de cetero Protectorem & Procuratorem fore summi Pontificis, in omnibus Necessitatibus & utilitatibus suis, custodiendo & conservando possessiones, honores, Jura, &c.* Thus

(i) *Sacrar. Ceremoniarum S. Rom. Ecclesiz. lib. 1. Tit. 5. p. 23.*

Pope Innocent the Third made our King John Swear Fidelity and Allegiance to him, in this form (k)*Ego Johannes Rex Angliæ....fidelis ero....Ecclesiæ Romanæ ac DOMINO MEO, Innocentio Papæ 3. &c.*

(k) *Hen. de Knighton. de Eventibus Angliæ, lib. 2. p. 2420. & Math. Westmonast. ad Annum 1213. p. 272.*

And before this, Pope Gregory the Seventh (that Prodigy of wickedness and Papal Tyranny) sends Hubertus to William the Conqueror, (l) requiring him to Swear Allegiance and Fidelity to him and his Successors. 'Tis true, that the Conqueror had understanding enough to know His Royal Rights, and the Popes unjust pretences, and so (as well became a King) peremptorily refused to take any such Oath. *Fidelitatem facere nolui* (sayes he in his Letters to the Pope) *nec volo.* However, *hoc Ithacus vellet*; this power they pretended to, and (as they had ability and opportunity) required it, and (we may be sure) when they have an advantage and power, they will both require, and severely (by Interdicts, Anathemas and Excommunications) exact it. And well they might, if they had that vast Power and Jurisdiction over Kings, which the Canonists, Jesuits, Schoolmen, Casuists, Summists, and their greatest Writers generally give them. I shall (of many) give you some few Instances.

(l) *Ut sibi & successoribus FIDELITATEM faceret. Baronius Annal. Tom. 11. ad Annum 1079. num. 25.*

4. Cardinal Pool (m) after he had said, and (as he thought) proved; That the King was the product of the Pope and People; by them created and made King;

(m) *Libro ad Hen. 8. pro Ecclesiastica Unionis Dissolutione. Romæ, apud Antonium Badam Afulanum, p. 25, 26. It is in Folio, but the year when 'twas Printed not express'd.*

(n) SACERDOS in suo munere REGI PRÆCIPIT, NON CONTRA. Ibidem p. 26. col. 1.

(o) Henricus Rex LUCIFERI SUPERBIAM imitatur, dum se ipse VICARIUM CHRISTI constituit. Ibid. p. 17, col. 1.

(p) Polus Card. de Concilio. p. 91. Editionis in 8°.

(q) 2 Cor. 11. 5. & 2 Cor. 12. 11.

(r) Act. 25. 10, 11.

(s) Imperator PAPÆ RE DIVINO SUBJECTUS, etiam in TEMPORALIBUS. Azorius Institut. Moral. Tom. 2. lib. 10. cap. 6. p. 1041.

(t) Unicus DEI VICARIUS PONTIFEX ROMANUS, habet SUMMAM potestatem & IMPERIUM super OMNES REGES & Principes TERRÆ. Blasius Bagnus de S. Romanæ Ecclesiæ Dignitatibus. Tract. 7. p. 83.

(u) Ibid. p. 84.

and that the Office of the Pope and Priest, was the Office of a Father, the King being his Son. He adds.... That *Officium Patris est PRORSUS MAJUS REGIO ET DIVINUS*. And then he has put these words in the Margent (that they might be taken into special consideration) (n)....The Priest **COMMANDS THE KING, but the KING CANNOT COMMAND THE PRIEST**. The Priest then is superior, and the King his subject: and so good night to the Kings Supremacy. And a little before, he says (o)....Henry the Eighth imitated the **PRIDE** of LUCIFER, when he made himself **VICAR** of Christ. This is pretty well; but as the Pope desires, so the Cardinal (and others generally) give him more (p).....*Petri Cathedram SUPER OMNIA IMPERATORUM solia, & OMNIA REGUM tribunalia CONSTITUIT CHRISTUS*. The Pope (by their Divinity) is *jure divino*, superiour to all Kings and Emperors: And yet St. Paul (q) (equal to St. Peter, and far above any of his successors) acknowledges that the Emperor (r) (and he a Pagan) was *his Judge*; and *legal superior*, and (as such) Appeals to him. Azorius (a great and learned person) confirms the Cardinals Opinion; and tells us (s) **That the Emperor, BY THE LAW OF GOD, is SUBJECT to the POPE, even IN TEMPORALS**. And since him, a learned Man, and Prior General of his Order, tells us (t), **That the Popes EMPIRE is over ALL THE WORLD** (Pagan and Christian) and that **HE is the ONELY VICAR OF GOD, who has SUPREME Power and EMPIRE, over ALL KINGS and PRINCES OF THE EARTH**. And again (u).....*Sicut unus est Deus, monarcha*.

monarcha omnium ; sic inter homines , UNUS DEBET esse PRINCEPS & MONARCHA , qui OMNIBUS MORTALIBUS præsit & DOMINETUR , DEI scilicet VICARIUS . Non igitur Petrus SUB REGE , sed REGES SUB PETRO esse DEBENT , sibi que & suis SUCCESSORIBUS INCURVARI , TENENTUR , & COLLA SUBMITTERE . And a little after (x).....Unus Dei

(x) *Ibid.* p. 85.

Vicarius OMNIUM PRINCEPS & DOMINUS , Cui IMPERATORES , REGES , & Potestates OMNES HUMILITER OBEDIANT , sintque SUBJECTI .

And good reason they should be so (if he say true) for Princes have all their Power and Authority from the Pope.....*Sicut luna accipit lumen à sole , sic REGIA potestas recepit auctoritatem , NON ALIUNDE nisi A PAPA .* And for the proof of this, he cites

two great (y) Lawyers (and might have cited an hundred more) *Johannes Andreas , and Hostiensis ... (*) Multas rationes afferunt Johannes Andreas & Hostiensis quibus probant , Papam esse Principem & MONARCHAM , & SUPERIOREM Laicorum omnium & Clericorum .* Nay , 'tis THE DUTY OF ALL KINGS, to suffer the Pope to domineer over them

(y) *Ibid.* p. 85.

(*) *Ad Can. Nemo 13. & Can. Aliorum. 14. Caus. 9. Quæst. 3.*

(z)....*DEBET Potestas Spiritualis Temporalis DOMINARI .* Nay , they are damn'd if they do not submit : for so the Lemma , or Title to that impious

Extravagant of Pope Boniface the Eighth. *Omnes Christi fideles* (the Text and Gloss expressly say it) *DE NECESSITATE SALUTIS SUBSUNT ROMANO PONTIFICI . Qui utrumque (a) gladium habet , & OMNES judicat , & A NEMINE judicatur .*

The Pope has both Swords, that is, (as their Infal-

libe

(z) *Glossa ad cap. Unam Sanctam. de Majori & Obed. in Extravag. Commun. Verbo, porro subesse, in Respect. ad 3. Argumentum.*

(a) *Luc. 22. 38. 1. It cannot appear that Peter had them both. 2. Nor that they were given him by Christ. 3. Nor that they signify'd two distinct powers. 4. Nor that Peter might use them both, who was severely condemn'd for using one, Mat. 26. 51, 52.*

lible Judge, the Pope, falsely and ridiculously expounds it) both the Spiritual and Temporal Power; and is *SUPREME MONARCH*, above all Kings. Nay further, they blasphemously say, That our Blefſed Saviour had not done *DISCRETELY*, unleſs he had left ſuch a Supreme Monarch over his Church at his Aſcenſion to govern the World, (b)....*Non videretur Dominus fuiſſe DISCRETUS, niſi unicum poſt ſe talem Vicarium reliquiſſet.*

(b) Gloſſa ad dictum Cap. *Unam Sanctam.*

And, (to fill up the meaſure of their Blaſphemy againſt God, and their ſordid and impious flattery of the Pope) Hence it is, that they declare the Pope to be *more than Man*,

(c) Gloſſa verbo Papa ad Proœmium Clementinarum.

(c) *Papa ſtupor mundi....Qui maxima rerum Nec Deus, nec homo, quaſi neuter eſ inter utrumque.*

So the Gloſs upon the *Clementines*, in their Canon-Law. And the famous Inſcription (if I forget not) on an Altar at Rome, is as blaſphemous (or rather more) as the former. The words theſe; *Paulo 5º VICE-DEO, Pontificia OMNIPOTENTIÆ vindici acerrimo*, &c. where although *VICE-DEUS*, ſignifie ſomething leſs than God; yet *Omnipotence* blaſphemouſly attributed to the Pope, muſt ſignifie, that he was more than Man. But there is another Gloſs, which does not mince the matter, but in plain words, ſpeaks down-right blaſphemy: in which it is (d) *Dominus DEUS noſter Papa*. So that theſe Gloſſes, though they agree in Impiety, and are both blaſphemous; yet they contradict each other; the one ſaying, that the *Pope is God*; the other, that he is *neither*

(d) Gloſſa ad Cap. *Cum in* tit. 4. verbo, *declaramus*. De verb. Signif. in Extravag. Johan. 22.

ther God nor Man. Now, if this be true, I desire some of their Canonists would inform me, what they think the Pope is. For if (according to their Law) he *neither be God nor Man*; seeing (I suppose) it will be granted, that he is a rational Creature, and no good Angel, he must be (by their Law and Logick) *an incarnate Devil*. I do not call him so; but only shew, what (by the just consequences of their impious and blasphemous Glosses) he must be.

5. And here, it may not be unworthy of our observation, that although *Thomas Manrique* (Master of the sacred *Palace*) in the year 1572. *thought* (e) *fit* to have this impious Gloss left out, and has (in Print) published his opinion: yet Pope (f) *Gregory the XIII.* thought otherwise, and approves and passes this blasphemous Gloss (with such others) and so it still remains in the (g) *Roman* and (h) *Parisian* Editions. Now although the *Congregatio Indicis*, and their Inquisitors, in their *Indices Expurgatorii*, take particular notice of, and Damn such Sentences as these (though Principles of Christian Religion evidently contain'd in Scripture) (i) *Abraham fide justus*. (k) *Christus credentibus salus*. (l) *Iustitia nostra Christus*. Omnes (m) *summi peccatores*. I say, though they constantly Damn such Sacred Truths, and command them to be expung'd; yet this impious Gloss (making, as they think, for the Popes absolute Monarchy) stands untouch'd, in their last and best Editions of their *Canon-Law*. Onely they have in the last Edition (I have yet seen) added this Note in the Margent, over against the Gloss (n).....*Hæc verba*

sano

(e) *Censura in Glossas Juris Canonici*. Colon. 1572. p. 13. 14. & 52.

(f) *Vide Bullam ejus datam Romæ 1. Jul. 1580. præfixam Juri Canon. Paris. 1612.*

(g) *Anno 1680.*

(h) *Paris. 1612.*

(i) *Index Expurgat. Hispan. Juxta exemplar. Madriti. 1667.*

p. 99.

(k) *Ibidem*, p. 112. Col. 2.

(l. m) *Ibidem*.

(n) *Edit. Jur. Canon. Paris. 1612. Clement. Col. 4. in margine, ad Proœmium Clementinarum.*

sano modo sunt accipienda. And that is (according to the meaning of *Johannes Andreas*, the Author of that Gloss) those words must be taken so, as they make most for the Popes Supremacy: for so it immediately follows.... *Prolata enim sunt ad ostendendam amplissimam esse Pontificis Romani potestatem.*

Now this Supremacy of the Pope being granted, (which their Lawyers, Authentick Laws, their Canonicists and Councils, and all their greatest Writers, *Jesuits* especially, generally contend for) it evidently follows, that the Pope is the sole and onely Supreme Power on Earth; and so all Kings and Emperors are, and must be his Subjects, and so must lose that Supremacy, which (by the Laws of Nature and Scripture) does *de Jure* belong to them: For they say, and industriously endeavor to prove this Absolute Supreme Power and Monarchy of the Pope, over all Kings and Emperors in the World. I shall, to satisfy you, bring two or three more Witnesses to prove it.

(o) *Abrah. Ezovius de Pontifice Romano.* Coloniz Agrip. 1619. says,

1. *Papa est Christianorum Monarcha*, cap. 1.
2. *Mortalium supremus*, cap. 3.
3. *A quo Provocatio nulla*, cap. 16.
4. *Judex celi, & in judicio terreno supremus*, cap. 32.
5. *Arbiter Orbis*, cap. 45.

I. *Abraham(o) Ezovius* tells us, 1. That the Pope is **MONARCH of ALL CHRISTIANS** (Kings and Emperors included.) 2. That he is **SUPREME over ALL MORTALS.** 3. That there lies no **APPEAL** from him. 4. That he is **JUDGE of HEAVEN**, and in all **EARTHLY JUDGMENTS SUPREME.** 5. That he is, **THE ARBITRATOR of THE WORLD.** These (and many more such) *Ezovius* industriously endeavors to prove out of their Popish Authors. Nor is his Book any surreptitious Work, clandestinely publish'd, such

such as *Rome* would not own ; for it comes out, with all the Solemn Approbations and Commendations of his Superiors, and the *Apostolick Inquisitor* ; who thus approves *Bzovius* his Book (and so all the above-mention'd Extravagant and Antimonarchical Positions)

(p)---Seeing it sufficiently appears, by the APPROBATIONS of the DOCTORS, and the Authors FAMOUS NAME ; that the Learning of this present Work is SINGULAR, and the DOCTRINE SOLID, both IN FAITH and MANNERS ; therefore I think it fit to be publish'd, FOR THE COMMON UTILITY. So that this Doctrine of the Popes Supremacy, above all Kings and Emperors, is not *Bzovius* his private Opinion, but has the Approbation of the Roman Church (at least in the Judgment of those who approved it) being attested by those, who (by that Church) are impowered for that purpose.

(p) Vide Approbationes libro Bzovii, De Pontifice Romano præfixus ; in Approbatione Inquisitoris Apostolici Cum de præsentis Operis SINGULARI eruditione, SOLIDÆQUE IN FIDE AC MORIBUS DOCTRINA, tam ex DOCTORUM CALCULO, quam ex Authoris CELEBRITATE NO MIN E, satis CONSTET, censeri ut ad COMMUNEM UTILITATEM excedatur, &c.

II. My next Witness is *Isidorus Mosconius* (Vicar-General to the Archbishop of *Bononia*, and a learned Lawyer) who tells us (q)---That the Pope is UNIVERSAL JUDGE, KING OF KINGS, and LORD of LORDS, because his Power is of God ; That GODS TRIBUNAL and the POPES, is one and the SAME, and that they have the SAME CONSISTORY : and therefore ALL other Powers are HIS SUBJECTS, and that the Pope is JUDGED of NONE BUT GOD ; not of THE EMPEROR or KINGS, or of the CLERGY or LAITY.

(q) Isod. Mosconius, de Majest. Ecclesie Militantis, lib. 1. cap. 7. p. 26. Venetiis 1602. Pontifex Rom. est Juxta Universalis, Rex Regum, & Dominus Dominantium, eo quod ejus Potestas à Deo est, & nullum habet superiorem nisi Deum : Estque unum Tribunal inter Deum & Papam. Ideo omnes alie potestates ei subdite sunt, & à nemine judicatur, nisi à Deo ; non ab Augusto, non à Regibus, nec à Clero aut Populo. Et p. 640. in Margine, Papa est omnium Principum Monarcha, &c.

D

And

And he cites many of their Canons and Councils, which (as positively as he) say and prove the same thing.

III. *Celsus Mancinus* (De Juribus Principatuum, Romæ 1596. lib. 3. cap. 1, 2.) is not far short, in attributing an *absolute supreme Power* to the Pope, even in Temporal things. For (in the place cited) he tells us *Three* things (which he fully proves, out of their best Authors.) (r) 1. *That the Pope is LORD OF THE WHOLE WORLD.* 2. *That the Pope (as Pope) has TEMPORAL POWER.* 3. *That this temporal power of the Pope, is, of ALL OTHER POWERS in the World most EMINENT; and ALL other Powers DEPEND on the POPE.* But let this pass; I shall cite you a greater Authority which will not only tell you, that the Papal Power is greater than Regal and Imperial, but how much it is greater: for,

IV. Pope *Innocent the III.* (as *Infallible* as any of his Successors) tells us, that the Papal (s) Power, is as much greater than the Imperial, as the *SUN* is greater than the *MOON*. And the Gloss there (t) says, that is 47 times greater. He who put the Note in the Margin there, thinks this too little; and therefore he says, *Quinquagies septies*; The Papal Power is (according to his Arithmetick) 57 times greater than the Imperial. A Man would think, that (by these accounts) the Popes Power were great enough. But there

(r) Mancinus loco citato, tit. 1. Papa est TOTIUS ORBIS DOMINUS. 2. PAPA (ut Papa) habet POTESTATEM TEMPORALEM. 3. Potestas Pape temporalis, est OMNIUM aliarum Potestatum EMINENTISSIMA, alique potestates OMNES ab illo DEPENDENT.

(s) Innocentius. 3. cap. Soberbia, 6. Extra. de Major. & Obedientiâ.

(t) Pontificalis dignitas quadrages Septies Regali major. So the learned Gloss.

is an Addition there, (who was the Author of it, I know not) in which we are told, (you may believe so far as you think fit) that the *Papal Dignity exceeds the Imperial*, no less than 7744. so inconsiderable a thing (in these Mens account) is Regal and Imperial Majesty, in respect of the vast Greatness of Papal Supremacy.

In short; If you compare that Decretal of *Innocent the Third* (but now cited) with that famous Extravagant of Pope (u) *Boniface the Eighth*, (both which are received into the Body of their Canon-Law) you will find them cite several places of Scripture, (miserably mis-understood) and bring reasons to prove the Papal Power above the Regal and Imperial. But the consequences they draw from those Texts they cite, are so far from being Infallible, that they are (like those who cite them) evidently false; and what other Arguments they bring, are not only unlike reason, but ridiculous: yet although neither the Reasons, nor the Authority of their Popes, nor the general consent of the ablest Writers *Rome* has, (who all endeavor to establish the same Position, and the Popes extravagant Supremacy) can prove that he really has such Power, (nor are they cited by me to any such purpose) yet they clearly prove that they own that Doctrine (which is all I aim at) and (though they cannot) gladly would make it appear probable, and have us and all others to believe it.

6. And further, from this unlimited Supremacy of the Pope, they conclude (and publicly profess)

(u) Bonifacius 8. cap. U-
nam Sanctam. 1. de majori-
tate & Obed. Extrav. Com.

his power to depose Kings, absolve their Subjects from all Oathes of Allegiance, and dispose of their Kingdoms. That this may appear, I consider,

1. That to cite particular Popish Writers, would be endless, and needless; that Bellarmine, Emanuel Sa, Suarez, Mariana, Turcremata, &c. that the Canonists, Casuists, Schoolmen, Summists, Jesuits, &c. are generally (if not universally) of this opinion, (That the Pope may depose Kings, &c.) is notoriously known to all, who know them. I shall only instance in two or three (to give you a taste of that impious doctrine, which all of them profess, assert, and (so far as they are able) vindicate, &c.) And here, 1. *Celsus Mancinus* (a learned Canon-
Regular of the Order of St. *Augustine*) tells us, that

(x) Conspicuum est OMNI-
BUS, à Summo Pontifice DE-
RONI PRIVARIque Impera-
tores, idque non TANTUM
ratione eorum quæ ad FIDEM
spectant, veram etiam & eorum
quæ ad MORES & JUS CI-
VILE spectant. *Celsus Man-*
cinus De Juribus Principatu-
um, lib. 3. cap. 3. pag. 76. Ro-
mæ 1596.

(y) *Bzovius De Pont. Ro-*
mano, cap. 46. p. 621. col. 2.
Col. Agrip. 1618. 1. Potestas
secularis subdita est spirituali, ita
ut non sit iudicium usurpatum, si
potestas spiritualis de temporalibus
iudicet. 2. Papa summam ha-
bet potestatem etiam in Reges &
Principes Christianos, qui eos
corrigat, officio amoveat, & in
loco eorum alios constituat. 3.
Papa potest Regem propter Heres-
in, Schisma, crimen intolerabile
in populo, negligentiam, aut so-
ordiam, si iuramento dato, in
rebus gravissimis non satisfecerit,
aut Ecclesiam opprimeret, DIG-
NITATE REGIA EX-
VERE.

(x)....It is EVIDENT TO ALL, THAT EMPE-
RORS ARE DEPOSED and DEPRIVED by the
Pope, and that not ONELY FOR things pertaining
TO FAITH, but ALSO for things pertaining to
MANNERS and the CIVIL LAW. And *Abra-*
ham Bzovius (more fully) sayes, (as generally the
rest do) 1. (y) That the secular power IS SUB-
JECT to the SPIRITUAL; so that it is no usurpa-
tion, if the Spiritual JUDGE the Secular. 2. The
Pope has SUPREME POWER over Christian
KINGS and PRINCES, who may CORRECT, DE-
POSE, and PUT OTHERS in their PLACES. 3. The Pope may DEPRIVE a KING of his Royal
Dignity for HERESY, SCHISM, for any intolerable
crime, negligence, or laziness, if in great matters
he break his Oath, or oppress the Church, &c. So that
in all these cases (by him there mention'd, and they
are

are Eight or Nine) *the Pope may depose a Supreme Prince*; and the Pope himself is **SOLE JUDGE** both of the **CRIME** and **Condemnation**. And to make all this good, 1. he gives us a (2) Catalogue of above Thirty Kings and Princes, who have (*de facto*) been Deposed, or (by Excommunications and Anathema's) Damn'd by the Pope. 2. And then he cites the Canon of a (*) General Council of their own, (of which anon) and above an hundred eminent Authors of their own Church, who assert and justify that Impious Opinion. 3. And then he further adds, that AN INNUMERABLE company of **ENGLISH MARTYRS** (following their Captain *Edmund Campian*, a Villain Condemned and Executed for (*) *High Treason*) did with their Pens and Blood maintain the same Opinion.—**INNOMERABILES etiam Anglitani MARTYRES DUEGEM Edmundum CAMPIANUM secuti, pro PRIMATU Romani Pontificis, ab Hen. 8. & Elizabetha cæsi, Sanguine profuso, & stilo exerto idem docuerunt.** So that we may see, the Doctrine of the Pope's Power to **DEPOSE KINGS**, must be *de Fide*, an Article of Divine Truth, and They Martyrs who die in defence of it: for *Campion* is with them, a (*) **MOST FAMOUS MARTYR.**

These Positions, asserted publickly and in Print, by Popish Authors, with so much confidence, and without any check of the Romish Church, of which they are Members; may justly seem impious and horrid to any sober Christian, who wishes well (as all good Subjects should) to Kings and Monarchy: yet I shall shew you greater Abominations. One

(2) *Bzovius loco citato, pag. 611, 612, &c.*

(*) *Ibid. pag. 619, 620, 621.*

(*) *Campion justly executed for High Treason, 24 of Eliz. 1581. Vide Camden's Elizæ, Lib. 3. pag. 239, 240.*

(*) **MARTYR CHRISTI INCLTUS**, & sibi scilicet **CLARISSIMUS**. *See Ribadeneira in Catalog. Scripturæ, Religionis Societatis Jesu, in Edmundo Campiano. Parsons the Jesuit says as much for Garnet, in his Discussion of the Answer of W. B. pag. 22, 23.*

of.

(a) Casp. Scioppius, in his Ecclesiasticum Jacobo Magnæ Britanniz Regi Oppositum, cap. 139. pag. 502. Edit. 1611.

of their (a) Authors, writing against King James, (of happy Memory) tells us,

I. That the Pope's Power (in the BELIEF of CATHOLICKS) is not barely Ministerial, but IMPERIAL. CATHOLICI (says he) non tantum MINISTERIO, sed & IMPERIO Papam præsidere CREDUNT. And this Papal Power

(b) Penes Papam in Ecclesia SUMMUM IMPERIUM, Potestas SUMMA, tam dirigit quam COGENDI, jus etiam VITÆ & NECIS in Papa residet. Ibidem cap. 138. pag. 426.

(c) Papa est SUMMUS DEI VICARIUS, Cæsar summus Ecclesiæ ADVOCATUS; quo NIHIL VLLI REGI amplius aut HONORIFICENTUS. Papa CAPUT est Corporis Christi. Cæsar ac REGES sunt BRACHIA seu MANUS. Itaque insania est dicere nullum Capitæ in Brachia Imperium esse. Papa (qui est Caput & vertex Ecclesiastici corporis) Spiritus Sancti inspiratione regitur. BRACHIA NIHIL facere possunt, nisi quod ad corporis Victum, amicum ac protectionem pertinet; quorum omnium Regimen ac præscriptum, quin penes Caput sit, & inde ad Brachia derivetur, Dubitare Paulus vetat, Col. 2. 19. Itaque si Reges non nutrant, neque assistunt Corpus. — Si Brachia aut Manus munera non fungantur, nec teneant Caput. — Ut membrum inutile. CAPITIS IMPERIO AMPUTENTUR. Ibid. cap. 241. pag. 511. If you desire to see more of the Pope's Deposing King's, Card. Baroniæ (in an hundred places) vindicates the Power, and approves and commends the practice. See his Annals, Ad annum 593. num. 8. & ad Annum 730. num. 5.

is (b) SUPREME, so that there resides in the Pope a right to direct and COMPEL, and a POWER OF LIFE AND DEATH. And to shew the reason of this, he adds; (c) That the POPE is the SUPREME VICAR of GOD, the Emperor Supreme ADVOCATE of the Church, than which NOTHING can be more HONOURABLE for any KING: (Surely Kings are much bound to him for that Honourable Office.) The POPE (as he goes on) is THE HEAD of Christ's Body; The Emperor and Kings are ARMS and HANDS; And therefore it is MADNESS to say, That the HEAD has not EMPIRE over the ARMS. The POPE, who is the Head and Top of the Ecclesiastical Body, is govern'd by the INSPIRATION of the Holy Ghost. The ARMS can do nothing, but what pertains to the Food, Rayment, and Protection of the Body. And St. Paul forbids us to doubt, that the Government and Prescription of all these, belongs to the Head, and from thence is derived to the ARMS. And therefore if Kings do not feed and cloath the Body, if the ARMS or HANDS do not do their Office, they may (by the Command of the HEAD) be CUT OFF, as unprofitable

unprofitable Members. These are his words, or the English of them.

So that (by this Popish Doctrine) the Pope, being Head of the Body, may, when he pleases, (for he is Supreme and Sole Judge in the case) cut off Kings and Emperors, who are but the Hands or Arms of that Body. And yet so hard is the Forehead of that Author, that he is not ashamed to say, (and put it in the Margent, that all might take notice of it) *That this great Power of the Pope, is (d) NOT AT ALL dangerous or prejudicial to Princes.* How dangerous this Doctrine of this Papal Supremacy, has been to Princes, the many Excommunications and Depositions of Kings and Emperors, in the six last Centuries, are evident and sad Witnesses; and what mischief (if not carefully prevented) it may do for the future, it will concern Princes, and all who are Loyal, and love Them, and their own Preservation, seriously to consider. It was a Wise Mans saying, That Protestant Princes may be too secure, but never safe, while any Jesuite dwells in their Dominions. *Tibannus* speaking of the fatal, and (by them, too secure) not fear'd Tragedy of *Hen. 3. and 4. of France*, he seems to blame their too great Security, and then adds: *MISEROS PRINCIPES, QUIBUS DE CONFURATIONE NON CREDITUR, NISI OCCISIS.* But to proceed.

(d) *Summa Pape potestas NIHIL PRORSUS PERICULI ADVERT REGIBUS.*
Idem cap. 141. pag. 512.

2. Another of their Authors, and he a Learned Bishop (*Jacobus (e) Simanca* by Name) tells us that, which concerns all Protestant Princes to consider, and what they must expect from the

(e) *Jacobus Simanca Euchir. Judicum Tit. 67. Sect. 12. p. 349. Antwerp. 1573. HÆRETICI PRIVATI SUNT OMNI DOMINIO & Jurisdictione, & EORUM SUBDITI ab eis LIBERI sunt, quod & REGES, & alios rerum Dominos comprehendit.*

the Pope, when he has Power to put their Traiterous Principles in execution. The thing he tells us, is this: *Heretiques* (says he, and we know who are meant by that hard word) are **ACTUALLY DEPRIVED OF ALL DOMINION and JURISDICTION, and their SUBJECTS FREED FROM THEIR OBEDIENCE: and this comprehends KINGS & OTHER LORDS.** (it is so) *Simanca*. Nor is this his private or singular Opinion: For, 1. He proves it expressly out of a Decretal of Pope Gregory the Ninth, extant in the Body of their (f) Canon-Law. 2. He cites (g) *Alphonsus à Castro*, who also proves the Position of *Simanca*, by evident Testimonies of many and eminent Popish Authors. 3. It is to be considered too, that *Simanca's* Book is Priviledg'd, and Licenc'd to be Printed by Publick Authority, and with the Approbation and high Commendation of the *Censor Librorum*, the Learned *Ben. Arias Montanus*; who tells us, that he had read it, (h) and judged it **HIGHTLY PROFITABLE, for the Knowledge and PRACTICE of the WHOLE Argument undertaken, and that it contain'd NOTHING OFFENSIVE to the CATHOLICK FAITH,** (then, in that great Man's Judgment, that Rebellious Roman Doctrine, of Deposing Heretical Kings, and Absolving their Subjects from all Oaths of Allegiance, is not offensive to their Catholick Faith.) And therefore I JUDGE it **WORTHY**, that **FOR THE PROFIT OF MANT,** it be **A THIRD TIME**

(f) Cap. Absolutos. 16. Extra. de Hereticis.

(g) Alph. à Castro, de Justa Hereticor. Pun. Lib. 2. Cap. 7. &c.

(h) Valde utilem esse censet ad TOTUS argumenti suscepi cognitionem & PRAXIM, NILQUE continere quod CATHOLICAM FIDEM offendant: Ideoque DIGNUM judico, ut ad MULTORUM UTILITATEM, TERTIO, & etiam SÆPTUS edatur: So are the words in *Arias Montanus* his License of that Book.

TIME, and OFTNER, Published. So that this Doctrine, (That Heretical Kings are Depriv'd of all their Dominion, and their Subjects Absolved from all Oaths of Allegiance) is not only approved by *Simanca, Alfonso à Castro, Arias Montanus*, (all great and very learned Persons in the Church of Rome) but by their Canon-Law, and the Decretal of Pope Gregory the Ninth. And it is further considerable, that this Doctrine (though Impious and Trayterous) is not (in any *Index Expurgatorius*, I have yet seen) condemned either in *Simanca*, or any other of all those, who generally assert and vindicate it.

3. One more I shall only cite, (though an hundred such might be cited) and he a famous Jesuite, who plainly tells us, (what their Society constantly profess, and many of them have, and do practise.) (i) That if a **CLERGY-MAN** Rebel against his **KING**, it is **NO TREASON**, because **CLERGY-MEN** are not the **KINGS SUBJECTS**. Nor is this the singular Opinion of *Emanuel Sa*; for it is approved, and highly commended, (by their *Censores Librorum*) both at the (k) beginning, and (l) end of that Book; and (as an (m) excellent and learned Person tells me) it was highly approved and commended at Rome too. So that (if such a multitude of eminent Popish Authors may have that credit they deserve in this particular) we may be sure, that this impious and trayterous Doctrine is approved and re-

E

ceived

(i) Clerici rebellio in Regem, non est crimen lese Majestatis, quia Clericus non est Regi subditus. Eman. Sa. Aphor. Confess. Verbo Clericus, pag. 41. Col. 1599.

(k) Opus Theologis, OMNI-BUSQUE animarum curam habentibus UTILE ac NECES-SARIUM.

(l) Hi Aphorismi DOCTI sunt ac PII, MULTAMQUE Utilitatem allaturi.

(m) Jac. Lefchassier operum pag. 421. Edit. Paris 1652.

(n) Phil. Maynardus de Privilegiis Ecclesiasticis. Dedicated to Pope Paulus 5. and printed at Ancona. 1607.

(1) Imperator subest Papa ut & Reges. Art. 5. Sect. 19. 21.

(2) Imperator & Rex ratione fidei & peccati gravis, possunt à Papa deponi & privari, Ibid. Sect. 23.

(3) Papa habet potestatem in toto Orbe, in Spiritualibus & Temporalibus; & in Temporalibus modo digniori, superiori, & perfectiori quam habent Principes seculares. Ibid. Art. 6. Sect. 1. & Sect. 11.

(4) Statuta Laicorum non obligant Clericos, Art. 13. Sect. 9.

(5) Vicarius Dei Omnibus Potestatibus Præponitur, SICUT IPSE DEUS, & PAPÆ SUBEST OMNIS CREATURA, Ibid. Art. 6. Sect. 11. 12.

(6) Papæ subesse, est DE NECESSITATE SALUTIS, & contrarium asserens, NON POTEST DICI CHRISTIANUS. Ibidem Sect. 13.

(o) Cap. Unam Sanct. De Major, & Obedientia, Inter. Extrav. Communes.

ceived in the Church of Rome. And though I said I would cite no more such Testimonies, to manifest so certain and clear a Truth; yet I shall add two more, (not unworthy your Consideration) which are (if that be possible) more highly impious than the former.

1. Then, a great Popish (n) Lawyer, (in asserting the Papal Power) has, and endeavours to prove these erroneous and desperate Positions.

1. The Emperour and Kings are the Popes Subjects.

2. The Emperour and Kings may be Deposed by the Pope, for Heresie and any great Sin.

3. The Pope has Power in the whole World, in Spirituals and TEMPORALS; and this TEMPORAL Power he has in a more Worthy, a Superiour and perfect manner, than Secular Princes.

4. Statutes made by Laymen, do not bind the Clergy.

5. The Pope is Vicar of God, and preferred before all Powers, as GOD HIMSELF; and EVERY CREATURE IS SUBJECT TO HIM.

6. It is necessary to Salvation to be Subject to the Pope, and he who affirms the contrary, IS NO CHRISTIAN.

This he has out of the (o) Canon-Law, and the Decretal of Pope Boniface the Eighth. So that by this impious and uncharitable Doctrine, all Protestant Kings, Princes and People, are deny'd to be Christians, and absolutely damned, without all hope or possibility of Salvation.

And

And yet their (p) *Canonists* (to say nothing of others.) and (q) *Jesuites* generally, (nay, (r) universally) approve and defend it, and the Pope and (s) *Council* confirm and establish it. *Theologia hæc damnatoria, Pseudo-Catholica, Romana sit licet, tamen non est Christiana.* Let them brag (as usually they do) of their *Catholick Faith*; for my part, I can have no great Opinion of their Faith, who have little Charity, and damn all save themselves.

- 2 Once more, (t) *Stanislaus Orichovius*, (while he magnifies the Pope and his Papal Greatness, with high contempt of Kings, and Blasphemy against God.) hath this passage, unfit to fall from the Pen of any sober Christian, (u) *The PRIEST* (says he) *excels THE KING, as much as a MAN excels a BEAST.* And says further, *HE WHO PREFERS THE KING BEFORE THE PRIEST; he prefers the CREATURE before the CREATOR.* This is strange Doctrine, and yet approved at Rome, at least not condemned there, (as Antimonarchical Positions, which decry Royal, and magnifie Papal Power, seldom, or never are) the reason why I say and believe this, is; Because I find in the (x) *Spanish Expurgatory Index*, some other things of this Author censur'd; but this passage now cited, is neither medled with, nor once mentioned.

(p) Vide Glossam ad dictum Cap. unam Sanctam : & Card. Turrecrematam summa de Ecclesi. Lib. 4. Part 2. Pag. 409.

(q) Vid. Bellarmin. de Pont. Rom. Lib. 5. cap. 7. Sect. Item. Sect. sic enim.

(r) Vid. Apologiam Jesuitarum, Editam Anno 1591. cum hoc Titulo. *La verité defenduz.*

(s) Vid. Sanction. Pragmat. (Paris 1613. in Quarto) pag. 1042. & Concil. Lateran. sub Leone 10. Sess. 11. apud Binius. Tom. 9. Concil. pag. 153.

A. And that *OBDIENTIA VERA* (and so *Subjection*) is due and to be given *Jesu Christi Vicario Pontifici Romano*, is an Article of their New CREED. (contrived at Trent) *EXTRA QUAM NULLA SALVUS ESSE POTEST*; and to the belief of this, all their Ecclesiasticks solemnly swear. Vid. Bullam Pii. 4. super Forma Professionis Fidei, in Concilio Tridentino. Sess. 25.

(t) Stanislaus Orichovius in Chimæra, pag. 99.

(u) *Sacerdos prestat Regi, Quantum HOMO prestat BESTIÆ. Qui Regem prestat Sacerdoti, is CREATURAM aneponit creatori.* loco citato.

(x) Index Expurgatorius Hispan. in Stanislaus Orichovio.

But to pass by particular Testimonies of single Popish Authors, (who publickly assert, and industriously

ously endeavour to Vindicate this Rebellious Doctrine, That Kings may be deposed and murdered by the Pope or People.) I shall give you greater, and (to the Church of Rome) more Authentique Authority. As for instance,

(y) Decretum Gratiani E-MENDATUM, jussu Gregorii. 13. Editum, juxta Exemplar ROMANUM, DILIGENTER RECOGNITUM. Paris, 1612.

(z) Gregorius Papa. 13. in Bulla Corpori Juris Canonici præfixa. Dat. Romæ. 1580. Anno Pontificatus sui. 9.

1. Their (y) Canon-Law, approved, received, used and obey'd in their Church, as a Rule of Justice in all their Courts and Consistories. I shall quote their best Edition; Corrected, Approved, and Publish'd by the Popes Command, (and he Infalible no doubt) for so he himself tells us..... (z) *Nos providere volentes, ut hoc Jus Canonicum, sic EXPURGATUM, ad OMNES CHRISTI FIDELES SARTUM perveniat, ac ne cuiquam liceat operi QUICQUAM ADDERE, vel IMMUTARE, aut INVERTERE, sed prout in urbe nostra Romæ nuper impressum fuit, perpetuo integrum & INCORRUPTUM conservetur.* Now in his Canon-Law, so purged and corrected, that it might come to ALL THE FAITHFUL, (as the Pope himself tells us, who, if he were Infalible, could not, and if he were but an Honest Man, would not publish an Untruth) we are told,

(a) Vid. Can. Authoritatem. 1. Caus. 15. Quest. 6. Part. 2.

I. That the Pope may depose Princes, and then absolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, (a) A FIDELITATIS etiam JURAMENTO, Romanus Pontifex nonnullos ABSOLVIT, cum aliquos A SUA DIGNITATE DEPO-NIT. And having set down this for Law, it immediately follows,

II. That

II. That (b) another Pope (Zachary by Name) deposed the King of France; not so much for HIS INIQUITIES, but that he was UNPROFITABLE for such a Power..... And then he ABSOLVED ALL THE FRENCH from their Oath of FIDELITY: And then adds, ... That the Holy-Church (he means the Pope) does (by an usual Authority) so absolve Subjects from their Oaths to their Superiors.

(b) Alius enim Rom. Pontifex, Zacharias scilicet, Regem Francorum, non tam pro suis Iniquitatibus; quam pro eo, quod tanta potestati erat inutilis a REGNO DEPOSUIT, omnesque Francigenos a JURAMENTO FIDELITATIS, quod illi fecerunt, ABSOLVIT. Quod etiam ex AUTHORITY FREQUENTI facit Ecclesia. Ibid. Can. Alius 3.

Now concerning this memorable Canon, give me leave to observe,

1. That the Gloss tells us, (John Semeca, a famous Canonist, was Author of it) that Pope Gelasius maintain'd the Doctrine of deposing Emperors; (c) *Gelasius Papa scribens contra Anastasium Imperatorem, dicit, QUOD POTEST EUM DEPONERE PROPTER malitiam suam, &c.*

(c) Glossa ad dictum Canonem. verbo Alius.

2. In the Lemma, or Title of this Canon, (in the (d) old Editions of the Canon-Law) it was, *Gelasius Papa Anastasio Imperatori.* But in later (e) Editions the Title is this,..... *Pontificalis Autoritas A JURAMENTO FIDELITATIS nonnullos ABSOLVIT, unde Gregorius Papa.* The (f) Annotator tells us truly, that Gelasius could not speak of the French Kings deposition; seeing Gelasius was dead, above 240 years before Chilpericus (or Childericus, they write him both ways)

(d) Edit. Paris. 1519, &c.

(e) Edit. Lugduni. 1661. &c.

(f) Vid. Notam ad dictum Can. Alius, in Edit. recentioribus.

came

(g) Gregorius. 7. Regist.
lib. 8. Epist. 21.

(h) Vide Bullam Gregorii.
13. Dat. Romæ. 1. Julii 1580.
Corpori Jur. Can. præfixam.

(i) Eginhardus in Vita Caroli Magni, p. 4, 5. Edit. Col. 1521. who says—*Hildericus Rex, fuisse Stephanum, Romani Pontificis, depositus est.* This impious Fact of Pope Stephen, has been approved, and (in practice) imitated by many of his followers. *Szevius* (before cited) gives us a List of above 30 Kings and Princes, thus deposed by Popes, and Anathematiz'd.

came to be King of France. But they say, the words of this Canon are found in the (g) Epistles of Pope Gregory the Seventh, and therefore they do rightly refer them to him, as the true Author of them. Now, whether it were *Gelasius* or *Gregory* the Seventh, it is all one, (as to my present business) it is by them confess'd, that a Pope was Author of that *Rebellious passage*, *Gratian* refers it into the Body of their *Canon-Law*, and Pope (h) *Gregory* the Thirteenth approves, and (together with the whole Body of the Law, the Gloss and Annotations) confirms and ratifies it. Whence we may rationally conclude, that this Doctrine of the Popes Power to depose Kings, and absolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance (though impious and rebellious) is so far from being disown'd, or detested by all Papists (as some now pretend) that the Supreme power of that Church has not only approved, but establish'd it for Law. By the way; though you see, that *Gratian* and Pope *Gregory* say, that Pope *Zachary* was the Man who deposed the French King *Hildericus*; yet (i) an Historian of more Antiquity and Credit than either of them (notwithstanding *Gregories* Infallibility) tells us, that it was Pope *Stephen* (*Zacharies* Successor) who deposed him. So that all agree, that A Pope (it matters not which) was Author of that impiety.

3. When the Canon says, that the French King was deposed by the Pope, because he was *INUTILIS*, &c. the Gloss gives you the meaning of that word;*Non intelligas, INUTILIS, id est INSUFFICIENS, tunc enim ei dari debuit Coadjutor; sed quia DIS-SOLUTUS erat, cum (†) MULIERIBUS, & EFFOEMINATUS*; so that (by this Papal Law) we see, that (if the Pope please) the greatest Prince may be deposed for a very small matter.

(†) Ipse Papa Pater Patrum putatur, sed filiorum *VERUS* Pater: quod, qui Nopotes ejus, omnes norunt. II. Nepotismo, pag.—

4. When this Canon says; the Pope deposed the King of France; the (k) Gloss notes.....*Ergo Papa deponit Imperatorem*. And (least we should not take notice of it) these words (in their best Editions of the Canon-Laws (l) corrected, purged, revised, and whatever wicked men had put into the Text or Margent, contrary to the Catholick Faith, by Pope Gregories command expunged) I say (notwithstanding all this) these words are put in the Margent.....*IMPERATOR POTEST A PAPA DE-PONI*. Whence it is evident, that in Pope Gregories Opinion, this impious Doctrine and Position (though contrary to the true Christian) is not contrary to *THEIR ROMAN FAITH*; being expressly in those Glosses and Canons; in which, their Supreme and Infalible Judge says, There is *NOTHING CATHOLICÆ VERITATI CONTRARIUM*. Nor is this Pope Gregories singular opinion; th t the Pope may depose Kings. For seeing
it

(k) Glossa ad dictum, Canon. Alius. 3. Verbo; deposuit.

(l) Cum his quæ ab impiis Scriptoribus, extra in margine, vel intra aspersa fuerunt Catholice veritati contraria revidendæ corrigendi, expurgandi curam demandavimus — *FAM TOTUM EMENDATUM*, &c. In-Bulla dicta Gregorii. 13. Corpori Juris Canonici præfixa.

(m) One Article of the Trent-Creed is this...Item OMNIA à sacris CANONIBUS & Oecumenicis Conciliis definita INDUBITANTER recipio & profiteor... Hanc Catholicam fidem, extra quam non est SALUS profiteor, & ab aliis teneri, (quantum in me est) curabo. Ita habent verba Professionis fidei, in Bulla dicta Pii Papæ, 4. Concil. Tridentin. sess. 25.

it has been approved by their Popes, and their General Councils, (as you shall see anon) and for some Ages received amongst their *Sacred Canons*, (as they call them) it is become a *necessary part of their Creed*, (and no Salvation without the belief of it) to which all their *Secular Clergy, Archbishops, Bishops, and whoever has any cure of Souls*; and all their *Regulars* (at least the *Heads and Governors of them*) are *solemnly (m) sworn*. For they swear, promise, and vow, without all doubtings, to receive, and profess *ALL THINGS* defined and declared in the *SACRED CANONS, and General Councils*; and (so far as they are able) to make others receive them too. So that all their *Ecclesiastiques* (especially all who have any *Cure of Souls*) do not only believe this *impious Doctrine* of *Popes Power to depose Kings*, but they swear, both to *BELIEVE* and *PROFESS IT*, and (as far as they are able) make others do so too. How pernicious to *Kings and Princes*, such Principles, and such Persons, (sworn to Profess and Promote them) heretofore have been, the many sad and Tragical Examples of deposed Princes, in the six last Centuries, can abundantly witness, and assure us: And how pernicious (for the future) they may be, unless (with care and prudence) they be prevented, we, or our Posterity, may unhappily, and too soon see. *Dirum omen misericors, qui solus potest, averruneet Deus.*

5. Lastly ; If we consult Cardinal (n) *Turrecremata* (a very great and learned person) who well understood their sacred Canons, and in what sense the Roman Church received them) he, in his Commentary on the Canon before-cited, affirms, and endeavours to prove these following (v) Propositions.

(n) Johan. Card. de Turrecremata, ad Can. alius 3. Caul. 15. Quæst. 6. & in summa de Ecclesia, lib. 2. cap. 14. &c.

I. The Pope may DEPOSE the Emperor, or a King not subject to the Emperor.

(o) The Cardinals own words are these which follow,

II. The Pope may LAWFULLY absolve Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance.

I. Papa potest deponere Imperatorem, aut Regem, qui non subest Imperatori.

III. The Pope may depose Counts, Dukes, and other Barons, without the Consent of the Emperor, or those Kings, whose Subjects they are.

II. Papa LICITE potest absolvere subditos à juramento fidelitatis.

IV. Subjects (if they have the Popes consent) which they are sure to have (if it make for his interest) may depose their Kings. This he farther proves, and adds.....That if the King be a manifest Heretick (as all Protestants are with them) then THE CHURCH may depose him.

III. Papa potest deponere Comites, Duces & alios Barones, sine consensu Imperatorum, aut Regum quibus subijunt.

IV. Subditi (si habeant assensum Papæ) possunt Regem deponere.....Et si Rex sit manifestus HERETICUS, potest ab Ecclesia deponi.

The Premises consider'd, it will highly concern all Protestant Kings and Princes to look to it, who, (as Hereticks) are all damned, and (p) Anathematiz'd once every year, on Maundy-Thursday, in their *Bulla Cænæ Domini*. For, had they of Rome power to act according to their Principles, Pretences, and Interest, they would make short work, a speedy and thorough Reformation; and compel all Protestant (or, as they constantly miscall them,

(p) Vid. Bullam dictam à Clemente X. Editam, An 1671. 7. Cal. April. & Pontif. sui An. 1. in Bullario Rom. Lugduni 1673. p. 28. Sect. 1.

F

Heretical)

Heretical) Kings and Princes, to quit their Religion, or their Realms and Kingdoms.

Be it concluded then; that (according to the Approved and Received Doctrine of the *Roman Church*) *Kings and Princes* may be *deposed*, and their *subjects absolved* from their *Oaths of Allegiance*. And for the truth of what I here say; we have the *Precept and Practice of three Popes* (*Zachary, Gregory the Seventh, and Urban the Second*) and *three (q) Canons* grounded on that *Papal Authority*, received into the *Body of their Canon-Law*: which, when you have occasion, you may (for further satisfaction) consult.

Now if you inquire, for *what Crimes* *Kings* may be *deposed* by the *Pope*; whether for *Heresie* onely (for that's universally agreed on) or for other *Crimes* also? *John Semeca* (Author of the *Gloss on Gratian*) gives us a *full and Categorical Answer*. For, 1. He (*r*) proposes the *Question*: *Pro quo peccato potest Imperator deponi?* For what *Sin* can the *Emperor* be *deposed*? (That he may be *deposed*, is (in that *Law*) no *Question*, but an *undoubted truth*; the *Question* onely is, for what *Crimes* it may be done.) And the *Answer* is.....(*s*) *That he may be deposed for ANY SIN, if he be INCORRIGIBLE; and not onely for his sins, but if he (t) UNPROFITABLY manage that Regal Power*: And this he proves out of another *Canon*. This is the *sad condition of Kings and Emperors* (by the *Popish Canon-Law*) they may be *deposed* (if they be *incorrigible*) for *ANY SIN*, and sometimes for *no sin*; at least as the *principal cause of their deposition*. Whereas (by the *same Law*)

(q) Vide Gratian. Can. Alius. 3. Can. Nos Sanctorum. 4. & Can. Furiosus. 5. Caus. 15. Quæst. 6.

(r) Glossa ad Can. si Papa & Diff. 40. Verbo. A fide de-
vius.

(s) PRO QUOLIBET peccato potest Imperator deponi, si sit incorrigibilis. Ibidem.

(t) Papa Zacharias Regem Francorum, non tam pro suis iniquitatibus, quam quod tanta potestate erat INFELIX, deposuit. Can. Alius. 2. Caus. 15. Quæst. 6.

Law) if the Pope be so (u) prodigiously impious, that he not onely damn himself, but carry [I N-
 NUMERABILES POPULOS] innumerable people
 to hell with him, yet there is no deposing, or Judg-
 ing him. This not only the Canon in Gratian, but
 a long Annotation (lately added, since Gratians time)
 approves, and confirms: and Pope Gregory the Thir-
 teenth approves both the Canon, and Annotation, in
 his (x) Bull, I have so often mention'd. So that
 (according to this Law) If the Emperor, or any
 King, will not be good Boyes, and obey their Grand
 Maister (Dominum DEUM NOSTRUM, as they
 call him) the Pope; if they will not be corrected by
 him, and amend what he thinks amiss (for he is
 Supreme and Sole Judge of the Crime and Punish-
 ment) Then the Pope may, and (if he have ability
 and opportunity, we may be sure) he will depose
 them.

(u) Dicto Can. si Papa, 6
 Dist. 40.

(x) Bulla Gregorii. 13:
 Corp. Jur. Can. præfixa.

Thus much (and may be too much) for the
 Canon-Law; that Sink of Forgeries, Impiety, and
 Disloyalty. For I scarce know any Book, where-
 in are more forged Writings (under good names
 sometimes) for bad purposes; or more Impious
 Doctrines and Positions own'd and authoriz'd for
 Law, and that by one who pretends (though with-
 out, and against all reason) to be Christ's Vicar,
 and Infallible; or any Book which has more Sedi-
 tious and Rebellious Principles of Disloyalty.. This
 I onely say now, but when I have (what now I
 want) time, and opportunity; I can, and (Σωθ' Οἶω)
 will make it good. How dangerous, and (when

(a) Vide Gratian. Dist. 96. in Lemmate, & Can. 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. Cujus Lemma est. *Quod Imperatores debent Pontificibus SUBESSE, non PRÆESSE.* Can. etiam 12. Can. etiam 1, 3, 4, 5. Caus. 5. Quest. 6. & Can. *Excommunicatorum.* 47. Caus. 23. Quest. 5. & cap. *Vergentis*, 10. & cap. *Excommunic.* 13. & cap. *absolutos.* 16. Extra De Hæreticis, & cap. *Gravem.* 13. Extra de Pœnis. & cap. *Ad Apostolica.* 2. De sent. & re Judicata, in 6. & 7. Decret. lib. 2. Tit. 1. cap. 1. Cujus Lemma est *LAICIS in Clericos NULLA POTESTAS.* & 7. Decret. lib. 2. Tit. 2. cap. 2. & ibidem lib. 5. Tit. 3. De Hæreticis & Schismaticis. cap. 9. &c. Et cap. *Nimus* 30. Extra De Furejurando. Cujus Lemma est. *Clerici non tenentur Laicis præstare Furamenta FIDELITATIS,* & cap. *Sollicita.* 6. Extra De Major. & Obedientia.

believ'd and practis'd) how pernicious to Kings and Princes, the Principles of that Law are, you may (in part) see by the premises: if you desire more, you may (at your leisure) consult, and consider those Places here *mention'd in the Margent* (a) with the Gloss and Case upon them; together with Cardinal *Turrecremata's* Commentary on *Gratians* Decree, and *Panormitan* on the *Decretals* (to omit all other Canonists) you will find Evidence, more than enough, to convince you, out of their own Testimonies, that the Principles of their own Law, as explain'd by their greatest, and best Interpreters, are not onely Dangerous, but Destructive of the Right of Kings, and inconsistent with that Loyalty, which (by the Lawes of Nature and Scripture) are really due to them.

3. But besides these Testimonies of particular Writers of their own Church, and their Approved, and (by Publick Authority) Establish'd, and Received Canon-Law, we have greater and more Authentick Testimonies, that in the Popish Church, they both profess and practice this impious and rebellious doctrine, of *Anathematizing*, and *Deposing Kings and Emperors*, of giving away their Kingdoms to others, and *Absolving their Subjects* from their Oaths of *Allegiance* and *Fidelity*. For their Popes (who are their Supreme and Infallible Judges) testify as much, in their *Breves* and *Bulls*; and those not forged, or corrupted by Hereticks; but Publish'd by themselves, and Printed at Rome, in their

their own (x) *Vatican Presc.* Where (to omit others) we have,

(x) Vid. Bullarium Romanum, per Cherubinum Romanæ Typograph. Cameræ Apostolicæ, Anno 1638.

1. The Bull of Pius the Fifth against Queen Elizabeth. The Title prefixed to that impious Bull, is this: (a) *DAMNATIO, & Excommunicatio Elizabethæ, Regina Angliæ, eique ADHERENTIUM*, Where (in one breath and Bull) he Damns that Innocent Queen, and all her Loyal Subjects, (Protestants and Papists.) Where (by the way) it is to be consider'd, That if any Papists be Loyal, (as by the Law of God and Nature they ought) to any Heretical King or Prince, (and at Rome, our Gracious King, and all Protestants are such) it is reputed their Crime, and they Damu'd at Rome for it. For it is not only (OMNES (b) & SINGULOS HÆRETICOS, QUOCUNQUE NOMINE CENSEANTUR.) All and singular Heretiques, of what sort soever, but also all those, who RECEIVE, FAVOUR, or DEFEND them. So that if any Roman-Catholick Favour, or (according to his Natural, or Sworn Allegiance) Defend his Prince, who is a Protestant, (and so a Declared Heretique) he is under the same Anathema and Condemnation. And this Anathema and Condemnation of all Heretiques, and all those who Favour or Defend them, is solemnly renewed every (c) year at Rome, and lately referred into the Body of their (d) Canon-Law.

(a) Dicti Bullarii. Tom. 2. p. 229. and in the Edition at Lyons. An. 1655. p. 303. It is dated 5. Cal. Maii. 1570. Elizabethæ Anno 13. Till which year all Papists came to our Common-Prayers.

(b) Vide Bullam Clementis 10 dat. Romæ. 7. Cal. April. 1671. in Bullario Cherubini Lugduni. 1673. Tom. 5. p. 528.

(c) In Bulla Coenæ Domini.
(d) Vid 7. Decret. lib. 5. Tit. 3. cap. 2. & 9. pag. 193. & 203. Edit. Lugd. 1661.

But to proceed: In this Bull of Pope Pius the Fifth, which contains the Anathema and Damnation (as 'tis called in the Lemma prefix'd to that Bull) of Queen Elizabeth; which proved *BRUTUM FULMEN*,

FILMENS, (the good and most gracious GOD) blessing what the Pope impiously cursed) we have these Particulars very considerable.

1. The extravagant Power the Pope assumes; when he tells us, That our Blessed Saviour *did* constitute Peter, and by consequence (e) *Him*, (as St. Peter's Successor.) ... **SUPER OMNES GENTES, & OMNIA Regna PRINCIPEM, ut EVELLAT, DESTRUAT, DISSIPET, DISPERDAT, &c.** These are the words of God to (f) *Jeremy*, (not Peter or his Successors) miserably misunderstood and misapplied by *this* Pope and (g) *his Predecessors*. Here is a pretence to a *vast and destructive Power*; and though it be a bare pretence, and (without any just ground) irrational and ridiculous; yet let Princes look to it. For when the Popes had Power, they did; and when they have, they will make use of it.

(e) *Christus* — *QUI NOS in hoc SUPREMO JUSSTITIÆ THRONO voluit collocare. Dictæ Bullæ Sect. 3.*

(f) *Jer. i. 10.*

(g) By *Innocent 3.* and yet it goes for Law. Cap. *Sollicitæ*, 6. Extra *De Major. & Obed.* and by *Boniface* the 8. cap. *Unam Sanctam*, 1. eodem Tit. Extravag. Com. &c.

(h) *Nos Apostolica potestatis plenitudine declaramus prædictam Elizabetham Hæreticam, eique adhaerentes, Anathematis sententiam incurrissæ, esseque A CHRISTI CORPORIS UNITATE PRÆCISOS. Dictæ Bullæ Sect. 3.*

2. This premised, he proceeds to his Damnatory Sentence, in these words: (h) *We* (saith he) by the Plenitude of Apostolical Power, declare the said Elizabeth an Heretick, and both her, and her Adherents, to have incurr'd the Sentence of Excommunication, and to be all cut off from the Unity of the Body of Christ. But this is not all; He proceeds (very unlike a Christian, and what he would be thought, Christ's Vicar) to depose her, from all her Royal Dignity, and all that Dominion, to which she had (by Birth,

Birth, the Law of God, and the Land) a just Right, in the following Form----

3. *And we (i) Deprive her of her pretended Royal Right, and all Dominion, Dignity and Priviledge whatsoever. He calls it, Her PRETENDED Royal Right, because (according to their Rebellious and Impious Principles) she being an Heretick, (as they miscall'd her) for that Crime she had lost her Royal Right, even before her actual Excommunication. Nor is this all; he proceeds----*

(i) Quinetiam ipsam pretenso REGNI FURE, nec non OMNI & quocunque DOMINIO, DIGNITATE, privilegioque PRIVATAM. Ibid. Sect. 4.

4. *And further, (k) we Absolve all the Nobility, Subjects, and People of England, and all others who have any way Sworn to her, from such Oath; and we declare them FOR EVER Absolved from any Obligation of Allegiance or Obedience to her; and we do, (by these Presents) Absolve them.*

(k) Item Proceres subditos & populos dicti Regni, ac ceteros OMNES, qui illi QUOMODOCUNQUE FURARERUNT, à FURAMENTO huiusmodi, ac OMNI prorsus dominii, fidelitatis & obsequii debito perpetuo absolutos & præsenti auctoritate absolvimus. Ibid. Sect. 5.

So that here, (so far as was able) he Absolves all her Subjects, from the Obligation of the Oaths, in which they had sworn Allegiance. But because there is, (as the Lawyers truly say) *A Natural, as well A Sworn Allegiance;* (for, by Birth, they who never swore it, owe a Natural Allegiance to their Prince, being born Subjects) lest, (after their Oath was null'd) they should Obey the Queen, and (upon the Principle of Natural Allegiance) think themselves bound so to do; He goes on, to declare this Natural Bond Null, and frees them from any Obligation of it: Thus:-----

5. *We (l) Command, and Forbid all the Peers, People and Subjects of England, to dare to give*

any

(l) Præcipimus & interdici-mus UNIVERSIS & singulis PROCERIBUS, subditis populi & aliis prædictis, ne ILLI, ejusve MONITIS, MANDATIS, aut LEGIBUS audeant OBEDIRE. Qui secus fecerint simili Anathematis sententia innodamus, Ibid. Sect. 5.

any Obedience to the Queen, her Majesties, Commands, or Laws. And if any do otherwise, we involve them in the same Sentence of Anathema and Excommunication. Whence it evidently appears, 1. That the Pope, in this Authentique Bull, and Decretory Sentence, does (so far as he is able) Depose the Queen. 2. Absolve all her Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance. 3. And (under pain of Excommunication) command and require them, (contrary to their Natural Allegiance) to give no Obedience to their undoubted Sovereign. Nor is this all; for,

6. When he had done all this, he gave away the Queens Kingdom, and Dominions, to Philip the Second, King of Spain; as is notoriously known, and (m) ingeniously confess'd by (an honest Roman Catholick) Father R. Caron, an Irish Priest.

(m) In depositione Elizabethæ, Pius 5. Fuit Britannia & Hibernia ad Philippum 2. translata vi cuius donationis, demandatus postea Sidonius fuit, Anno 1588. classe Hispanica instructus, ut Britannia regna possideret. Remonstran. Hibernorum per Frat. R. Caron.
Part. 1. cap. 3. Sect. 4. pag. 7.

(n) Bullarium Romanum. Tom. 1. p. 52, 53. Lugduni. An. 1655. Vid. Binium Concil. Tom. 7. part. 1. p. 484.

Many more such impious Bulls there are in that Roman Bullary, in all which Kings and Princes are Anathematiz'd and deposed by the Pope, and their Subjects absolved from their Oaths of Allegiance; on pretence of that vast and extravagant Supremacy and Dominion over all the World, (which they challenge by Divine Right, though without any, and against all Reason) even over Kings and Emperors. For instance, the Excommunication and Deposition of the (n) Emperor Henry the Fourth, who was twice Anathematiz'd by Gregory the Seventh.

Of

Of *Fredrick* (v) the Second. By *Gregory* the Ninth, and *Innocent* the Fourth. Of our King *Henry* (p) the Eighth, by Pope *Rome* the Third. And (to omit all others) we have an Excommunication of all Heretical Kings and Princes, and Heretiques in general, in that famous (q) *Bulla Cœne*, wherein (on Maundy-Thursd.) an *Anathema* is solemnly denounced against all Heretiques, even Emperors, (r) Kings, Dukes, and all of what Dignity soever: and this *Anathema* is repeated every year. So that (amongst others) our Gracious King, and all his Protestant Subjects, are Anathematiz'd and Curs'd once every year at Rome, as if their *Mont Vaticanus*, were become *Mount Ebal*, (s) from whence all Curses were to come. Now, whether this Doctrine and Practices of Popes be not dangerous and pernicious to Kings, let the World Judge.

Well, but if all this will not do; if the Testimonies of their own Writers, (which both for learning and dignity in their Church, are most eminent) nor their receiv'd and establish'd Laws and Canons; nor their Authentique Papal Bulls (†) and Decretal Constitutions: I say, if all these be not evidence enough, to intitle the Church of Rome to this Seditious, Impious, and (to Kings especially, if they be Protestants) Pernicious Doctrine; yet the Decrees and Canons of their own General Councils, (which, (by their own Principles and Confessions) are Representatives of their whole Church, and Infallible) I say, the Decrees of such Councils (if there be any such) will, and must be undeniable Evidences of what I have said in this particular. And, that their appro-

(v) Ibidem. p. 105. & p. 112. dicti Bullarii.

(p) Ibid. Tom. 1. p. 740. The Excommunication was dated 1533. and executed Anno 1538.

(q) Vid. dictum Bullarium. Tom. 3. p. 248. & Constitut. 62. Pauli 5. Ibidem, & plurimas ejusdem generis Bullas ibi indicatas.

(r) *Ecce Imperialis Regalis, Ducalis, et alia mundana excellentia singulorum.* They are the words of the Bull.

(s) Deut. 12. 29. & 19. 17.

(†) Vid. Pauli Papæ. 4. Bullam 12. in Bullario Cherubini. Romæ 1638. Tom. 1. p. 602. *Qua Imperatores Reges, &c. Hereticos, Imperii, Regni, & Dominii omnibus privatos pronunciat; Dominique illa omnia esse publicanda, publicata autem fore juris & proprietatis eorum, qui ipsa primo occupaverint.*

ved General Councils have approved this Doctrine of the Popes Power to depose Kings and Emperors; and absolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance; I shall give you two or three evident Instances.

(t) It is one of those General Councils, which the Council of Constance decreed all future Popes should swear to maintain: *Seff. 39. In forma Professionis a Papa faciendæ*, p. 750; Edit. 1514.

(u) *Cum fratribus nostris & sancto CONCILIO*, deliberatione diligenti prababit. *Cap. cum æterni*. 1. Extra de Sent. & re Judic. in 6. The Title to that Chap. is — *Innocentius 4. in Concilio Lugdunensi*.

(x) *Omni honore & dignitate fementiando privamus*. Ibidem.

(y) *Omnes qui ei framento fidelitatis tenentur astricti, a framento hujusmodi perpetuo absolvimus*. Ibid.

(z) *Quoslibet, qui ei, velut Imperatori vel Regi, Consilium, vel auxilium præstiterint, vel favorem Excommunicationis sententiæ subiacere*.

(*) *Concil. Lateranum Magnum, sub Innocentio. 3. Anno 1215. Can. 3. De Hæreticis*; and the Canon is received into the Canon-Law, by Pope Gregory the 9. *Cap. Excommunicamus*, 13. Extra de Hæreticis.

I. In the General (t) Council of Lions, (for a General Council they do universally acknowledge it) Pope Innocent the Fourth deposed the Emperor Frederique the Second; That he deposed him in that Council, is undeny'd by any I have yet met with; and that it was, after diligent deliberation had with his Brethren, and the Council, (u) appears by the form of the Excommunication, registred, and upon Record in the Body of their Canon-Law. Where, 1. He (x) deprives him of all his Honor and Imperial Dignity. 2. And then (y) absolves all his Subjects from their Oaths of Fidelity. 3. And (z) Excommunicates all who should acknowledge him King, or Emperor; or should counsel, assist, or favor him.

II. In the great Lateran (a) Council, (for so they commonly call it) in which (if they misreckon not) there were no less than 1215. Fathers) it was Synodically and Categorically concluded, That the Pope might depose Kings, absolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and give away their Kingdoms. The Series and Sum of the Canon is this; First, It is decreed, That all Secular Powers shall expel all (whom the Pope and his Party shall call) Heretiques,

tiqur, out of their Dominions, and they were to be admonish'd to do this, *Moneantur seculares potestates, &c.* Secondly, But in case they obey'd not that Monition, they were to be (b) COMPELL'D. And not only the Lateran, but the (c) Trent-Council, (a most Apocryphal Conventicle, as I shall, when required, make evident to you) useth the same *Saucy Language*, to Princes and Supreme Powers; (d) *(even Emperors, Kings, Princes, and all other of what State or Dignity soever)* for all these are (e) COMMANDED to observe all the Sacred Canons, and ALL GENERAL COUNCILS, (and so even the Lateran Council, and this Canon we are speaking of) which are in favor of Ecclesiastical Persons, and the Liberties of the Church; and they are to observe all these, and ALL OTHER PAPAL SANCTIONS, as the PRECEPTS OF GOD, and DIVINE ORDINATIONS. And the Lemma, (f) or Title to that Chapter, is this... COGANTUR, &c. LET ALL CATHOLIQUE PRINCES (and much more Heretical) be COMPELL'D to observe ALL the SANCTIONS concerning Ecclesiastical Liberty, &c. And this is the common and usual Language of their most eminent Writers, of their Popes and Councils: as you may see (to omit all others) in Cardinal (g) *Tuschns*, the life of Pope (h) *Gregory the Seventh* by *Platina*, and in the Lateran Council under *Leo the Tenth*, where the Pope in his Monitory against

(a) *Si necesse fuerit, per Censuras Ecclesiasticas COMPELLANTUR potestates seculares, &c.* Ibid. Can. 3.
(c) Concil. Trident. Sess. 25. De Reformat. cap. 10.

(d) *Imperatorem Reges, Principes, & OMNES, cuiuscunque status & dignitatis, &c.*

(e) *PRÆCIPIT sacros Canones, & Concilia Generalia OMNIA, & Apostolicas Sanctiones in favorem Ecclesiasticarum personarum, tanquam DE I PRÆCEPTA, Ordinationes Dei constituta, &c.*

(f) *COGANTUR OMNES PRINCIPES catholici, conseruare OMNIA SANCITA, &c.* In Lemmate dicto Cap. præfixo, in Edit. Concil. Trident. Anno 1634. if I forget not; for I have not the Book now by me.

(g) *Card. Tuschns, Co. Jur. sign. Pract. Juris. Tom. 6. Conclus. 41. S. ct. 40. 41. 61.*

(h) *Imperator potest COGI ad Officium Excommunicationis, & ARCMS, Gregorius. 7. apud Platinam in ejus Vita.*

(i) Leo 10. in Concil. Laterano, *Approbante Concilio*, apud Binium Concil. Tom. 9. p. 49. Edit. Paris. Ann. 1636. **REGES PEREMPTORIE RE-
CORAMUS.**

(k) *Heretici AB ECCLESIA NOTATI.*

(l) *Si requisitus neglexerit, per Metropolitanum & comprovinciales Episcopos Excommunicatio vinculo innodetur.* They are the words of the Canon.

(m) *Ut ex tunc ipse Papa & Alii ad ejus FIDELITATE demerant ABSOLUTOS, & TERRAM exponant CATHOLICIS OCCUPANDAM.*

the *Gallican Pragmatical Sanction*, fairly says, (1) **WE PEREMPTORILY COMMAND KINGS, &c.** Secondly, Well then, by this *Lateran Council and Canon*, we are speaking of, **Kings** are to be **COMPELLED**, by the **Pope**, to do *their duty*; and that is (as the Canon tells us) to expell all *Heretiques* out of *their Kingdoms*. And if you ask, **Who**, or **What Heretiques** these are? The same Canon tells you, That it is all those, whom the Pope and his Party, shall be pleased to (k) call *Heretiques*. Thirdly, And they (Kings and Princes) must be **COMPELLED** to take an **OATH**, and swear they will **Expel such Heretiques**; and this Oath they must take publickly, (that all may see and know that Princes obey the Pope) for the words of the Canon are,.... **Præstent JURAMENTUM PUBLICE, quod universos Hereticos, AB ECCLESIA NOTATOS exterminare studeant.** Fourthly, And if any King, or Prince (l) neglect this duty, and (when it is tendered) refuse the Oath, or to expel Heretiques out of his *Dominions*; Then the Metropolitan and the Bishops of his Province must **Excommunicate** him. Fifthly, And then if he persist contumacious, and refuse to give satisfaction by expelling all Heretiques; they must signify it to the **POPE**, that he (m) may **DEPOSE HIM, ABSOLVE HIS SUBJECTS FROM THEIR OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE, and GIVE HIS KINGDOM TO CATHOLIQVES.** So the Canon.

So that if the Pope, and a Popish General Council, very great for number, (but as for Learning and Loyalty little enough) consisting of 1215. Fathers, I say, if these may be Judges, Kings and Princes are Subjects and Slaves to the Pope, who may COMPEL them to expel as many of their own Subjects, as he shall call (or miscall) *Heretiques*, out of their Dominions; and impose an Oath upon them, to bind them to obedience; and unless they obey such Papal commands, the Pope may depose the Prince who disobeys, absolve his Subjects from all Oaths of Allegiance, and his Kingdom (forfeited to the Pope by his disobedience) may be given away, to any, to whom the Pope shall please to give it. Now whether such impious and rebellious Positions (approv'd and own'd by the Roman Church, in her greatest General Councils, which, she believes, (at least would have us believe) infallible) be not dangerous and pernicious to Princes, and destructive of their just rights, let the World Judge. I know, that although the (n) Jesuits and Canonists publicly approve and own the Doctrine of this Canon and the Lateran Council, and the consequences of it; yet some more sober Papists do not: And therefore two Answers (or insignificant shifts) are brought by some, to evade or mollifie, and lessen the impiety of those consequences, which are by Protestants inferr'd from it.

(n) See a Book lately printed, call'd, *The Jesuits Loyalty*. It contains three Letters of a Jesuite, (Father *Kein*, or *Keins*, (if I forget not) was the Man) in which this Lateral Canon, and all the consequences of it, are approv'd, and the Popes Power to depose Kings, (out of Popish Authors and Councils) largely, and *data Opera*, proved to be *de fide*.

1. Answer.

1. First then, say they, that the *Lateran Canon* is to be meant *only of Feudatary, or Subordinate*, not of *Absolute, or Supreme Princes*.

Refutation.

But this is an evident mistake of the meaning of the *Lateran Canon*, and *in terminis*, contradicts the express words and sense of the *Canon*. For,

1. By the *Canon*, *All Princes*, (*Supreme and Subordinate, and Feudatary*) if they refuse to expel all *Heretiques* out of their *Dominions*, are to be *Excommunicated* by the *Metropolitan* and the *Bishops* of his *Province*, and then *Depos'd* by the *Pope*; but with this difference express'd in the *Canon*. When any *Subordinate Prince* was *Depos'd*, it was with a (1) *Salvo*, or *Proviso*, for the *Rights* of his *Superior Lord*. The *Inferior Lord* *Depos'd*, loses only what was his own proper *Right*; his *Superior Lord* loses *nothing*. If the *Inferior Lord* was to pay any *Rents*, or ought any *Services* to his *Supreme Lord*, those he did not *forfeit*; but those remain'd *due* (as before) to the *Supreme Lord*. But on this condition, That the *Supreme Lord* *himself* did not (2) *concur* to hinder the *expulsion* of all *Heretiques* out of the *Dominions* of the *Feudatary, or Inferior Lord*: that is, if he hindered not the *Execution* of the *Popes* commands. For if he did; then even *he* (the *SUPREME LORD*) must be *Depos'd* too, as well as the *Inferior Lord*. The Law and Decree

(1) *Salvo Jure Domini Principis*. They are the words of the third Canon of that *Lateran Council*.

(2) *Dummodo ipse (Dominus Principalis) nullum praestet obstatum, &c. Ibidem*.

Decree of that Council, involves both the Inferior and Supreme Lords, (if both be guilty and negligent in expelling Heretiques) in the same Punishments of *Deposition*, and loss of their *Dominions*. For the Canon says, (t) **That THE SAME LAW MUST BE OBSERVED CONCERNING THOSE** who (have, and) have no **SUPERIOR LORDS**. That is; the *Supreme Lords*, (be it *King* or *Emperor*) if they Obey not the Pope's command, and effectually expel all Heretiques out of their *Dominions*, they must (by this Canon) be *Deposed*.

2. But admit (which is evidently untrue) that the Canon meant only *Fendatary* and *Inferior Princes* should be *Deposed* by the Pope. The mischief and injustice is less, (as a Subordinate Prince is less than the Supreme) but very great: and (even upon this false Supposition) this Power challenged by the Pope, (and approved by the *Lateran Canon* and *Council*) will be not only dangerous, but pernicious to Subordinate and *Fendatary Princes*. This is too plain to need any further proof.

The second Answer some bring to what we urge against Rome from the *Lateran Canon*, is this: (u) They deny that Council to be a General One, or (if it were) that it made any Canons: and therefore the Doctrine of that Canon (whatever it be) cannot be imputed to the Church of Rome, as Approved by it.

(t) *EADEM LEGE SERVATA CIRCA EOS, Qui non HABENT DOMINOS PRINCIPALES*. And this impious Doctrine was not only approved by *Honorius 3.* Pope Innocent 3. his next Successor, but approv'd, confirm'd, and refer'd into the Body of their Canon-Law by *Gregory 9.* cap. *Excommunicamus*, 13. Extra. de *Hæreticis*. Afterward *Innocentius 4.* Anno 1243. *Alexander 4.* 1258. *Clement 4.* Anno 1265. all confirm it, as appears in the *Bullarium Magnum Romanum Lugduni*, 1655. Tom. 1. pag. 109. col. 2. And lest it might be thought that they have alter'd their opinion now, and are become more favourable to Princes, they have lately added the confirmation of it by *Innocentius 4.* to the Body of their Canon-Law, *Lugd.* 1661. Vid. 7. Decret. Lib. 7. Tit. 3. De *Hæret.* & *Schism.* cap. 1. 2.

2 Answer.

(u) The Author of the Answer to *The Jesuites Loyalty*, London, 1678. pag. 12. Father *Preston*, under the name of *Wyberington*, &c.

But

Refut.

(x) In the Bull by which Innocent 3. call'd the Lateran Council, the Title is this, — *Indictio sacri & OECUMENICI Concilii Lateranensis* pro. 1. die Nov. 1215. In Bullario. Rom. Tom. 1. pag. 87. Edit. 1655.

(y) *Non video qua fronte audeat quis negare hoc Concilium esse Oecumenicum.* Joverius Concil. Part. 1. pag. 120. in Lemmate Concilio præfixo.

(z) Vid. Edit. Juris Canonici Paris. 1612, & 1618, & Lugduni. 1661, &c.

(a) So Bellarmine, Longa & Coriolano, Rives, &c.

But this is as *void of Ground or Truth*, as the former. For this *Lateran Council* (and the Canons of it) have been, and are universally received in the *Church of Rome*, the *Council* is (x) *Oecumenical*, and the Canons attributed to it, as *Genuine*, and not *Supposititious*, and *Spurious*. That this may appear, consider,

1. That all their *Writers de Conciliis* (which I have hitherto met with) do universally acknowledge it to have been a *General Council*, and commonly call it, *Concilium Lateranense Magnum*, and cite the Canons attributed to it, as *Genuine*.
2. All the *Popish Writers*, who have publish'd the *Councils*, or *Epitome's*, and *Sum* of them, (as *Crabb*, *Surius*, *Binius*, *Joverius*, *Caranza*, &c. publish it as a *General Council*. And *Joverius* confidently says, . . . (y) That he cannot see, with what *Face* any *Man* dare deny it to be a *General Council*.
3. In their last and best (z) *Editions* of their *Canon-Law*, there is (in the beginning) a distinct *Catalogue* of their *General* and *Provincial Councils*, acknowledged to be such, and this *Lateran* is ever reckoned amongst those which they admit as *General*.
2. There is a commonly received distinction amongst their *Writers de Conciliis*, wherein they (a) tell us, That *Concilia Generalia sunt*.
 1. *Approbata*. 2. *Reprobata*. 3. *Partim approbata*,

probata, partim reprobata. 4. *Nec approbata nec reprobata*, of which last sort they make the first Council of *Pisa*. Now this *Lateran Council*, (we are speaking of) they always reckon amongst the General Councils of the first Order, or those which are approv'd by their Church. Though this distinction of Councils be ridiculous, and inconsistent with Truth, or their own Principles; as (were it my business now, or pertinent) might evidently be proved: yet (by it) it manifestly appears, that the *Lateran Council* was (in their Opinion and Judgment) a General Council; which is that for which I produce it. But further, I say,

5. In their own *Canon-Law*, (and as in others before, so in a late and approved (b) Edition of it) this *Lateran Council* under Pope *Innocent the Third*, is acknowledged to be a General, or Oecumenical Council. For in the *Decretals*, publish'd by the Authority and Command of Pope (c) *Gregory the Ninth*, for the common (d) benefit, and with command that (e) they, (and none else without *Papal Authority*) should be used by all Judges in Judicature, and by Readers of Law in the Universities; and all this confirm'd by a Bull of (f) *Gregory the Thirteenth*. In the very first Chapter of those *Decretals*, the Lemma, or Title prefix'd to it, is thus: (g) *Innocent the Third, in a General Council*: And that we may be sure, 'tis the *Lateran Council* he means; a (h) great Lawyer in his Annotations, (subjoyn'd to that Bull of *Gregory*

(b) *Corpus Juris Canonici* Lugduni. 1661.

(c) Vide Bullam *Gregorii. 9. Decretalibus præfixam.*

(d) *Ad communem maxime studentium Utilitatem. Ibidem.*

(e) *Volentes ut hæc TAN- TOM compilatione, UNIVER- SI utantur, in FUDICIIS & SCHOLIS, &c. Ibidem.*

(f) *Bulla hæc Romæ data Anno 1580. Jul. 1. & Corp. Juris Canon præfixa.*

(g) *Cap. Firmiter 1. Extra, De Summa Trinitate. The Title to that Chapter is this:— Innocentius 3. in Concilio GENERALI.*

(h) *Antonius Naldus:— Hoc Concilium Romæ in Laterano celebratum, Anno 1215. & Innocentii 3. 18. assistentibus Hierosol. & Constantinop. Patriarchis, & TOTIUS FERE ORBIS EPISCOPIS, &c.*

the Ninth before mentioned) tells us; That this Council was held at Rome, in the Lateran, in the Year 1215. in the Eighteenth Year of Innocent the Third. The Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople, and the Bishops of almost the WHOLE WORLD, &c. So that if the Title of a Decretal publish'd by Pope Gregory the Ninth, or the Annotation upon it, by Naldus an eminent Lawyer, and the Approbation and Confirmation of both, by Pope Gregory the Thirteenth, be true; it will evidently follow, that the Lateran Council was a General or Oecumenical Council. And afterwards, in the same Canon-Law and Decretals, we meet with this Title to another Chapter;(i) *Idem in Concilio Generali*. And it appears, (both by the former (k) Chapters of that Title, and the Annotation on this) that Innocent the Third was the Pope, and that in the (l) Lateran was the Council, which is there call'd General. And afterwards (m) several times to the very same purpose; especially in the (n) Fifth Book of Gregories Decretals, and the Seventh Title; where this Impious Canon (for Deposing Kings, and Absolving their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance) is intirely Registred for Law, refer'd to Pope Innocent the Third, in his Lateran Council, and that Council declared Oecumenical.

6. Lastly, To put the matter out of doubt, that the Lateran Council was Oecumenical, and made Canons, the Council of Constans does (o) testifie

(i) Cap. Nimis. 30. Extra De Furejurando.

(k) Cap. Veniens. 16. attribuitur Innocentio. 3. and so are all the. 13. following, and this 30. of which we now speak.

(l) Concilium Lateranum sub Innocentio. 3. so says the Annotation. ad dictum cap. 30. tit. C.

(m) Cap. Qualiter. 24 Extra. De Accusationibus.

(n) Cap. Excommunicamus 23. Extra. De Hæreticis. Vid. Lemmadiſti Capituli, & Annotation. lit. A.

(p) testifie it several times, and expressly names it amongst those General Councils; to the observation whereof the Popes were to (p) swear, at their coming to the Papal Dignity. And although these Authorities be abundantly sufficient to satisfy our more sober Adversaries; yet I shall add one more, which may (I hope) silence the more Confident. It is the Authority of the (q) *Trent-Council*, which does expressly call it a General Council, and confirms one of its Canons.

(o) Concil. Constant. Sess. 19. pag. 126. Edit. in Octavo. Ann. 1514. & ibid. pag. 280. & pag. 312. In confirmat. Constitutionis Frederici. 2.

(p) Concil. Constant. Sess. 39. in forma Professionis à Papa Electo facienda.

(q) Sess. 24. cap. 5. de Reformat. pag. 290. Edit. Salamant. 1588. Constitutionem, sive Innocentio 3. in CONCILIO GENERALI, qua incipit. Quasi et quando Synodus innovat.

The sum of this Discourse is; That if the *Concurrent Testimonies*, 1. Of their own most learned, and (for Dignity) most eminent *Writers de Conciliis*; 2. Or their *Publishers of their Councils General and Provincial*; 3. Or many *Decrees of their Popes generally approved and received into their Canon-Law*, of the last, and (as they tell us) of the most correct *Editions*; 4. Or of their *General Councils* (for such they esteem them) of *Constance* and *Trent*: I say, if all these be of any validity, (and with them, some of those *Testimonies* are infallible) then it will evidently follow; 1. That this *Lateran Council* under Pope *Innocent the Third*, is (and, with them, must be) an *Oecumenical or General Council*. 2. And so, those *Impious and Damnable Positions* in the *Third Canon* of that Council, (1. That *Kings and Emperors may be Excommunicated by their own Bishops for not obeying the Pope*: 2. And *Deposed by the Pope*: 3. And their *Subjects Absolved by him, from their Oaths of Allegiance*: 4. And their *Kingdoms given*

away to those, who Obey and please the Pope:) I say, all those Positions, must be acknowledged to be the Doctrines of the Roman Church, being Decrees and Constitutions of her received General Councils, which she professeth to be infallible, and therefore obliging her to a firm belief of them. 3. This being evidently so, that the Pope and his Party (obliged thereunto, by their approved and received Canon-Law, and their General Councils) do believe, and publicly profess, such Impious, Traiterous, and Damnable Doctrines; it will be easie for all (who have good Eyes, and will use them) to see, how Dangerous and Pernicious such Principles are, to all (especially Protestant) Kings, Princes, and their People and Subjects. And that,

1. In point of Conscience, and in respect of their Souls and Salvation, if they believe and receive such Impious Positions and Principles.

2. In point of Civil Prudence, in respect of their Persons, Honors and Estates, if they receive them not.

1. In point of Conscience, if they submit to the Pope, and believe and receive such Heretical Positions, and Damnable Doctrines, it must of necessity, be Dangerous and Pernicious to their Souls. For this Argument will be both consequent, and evident: To believe Heretical and Damnable Opinions and Doctrines, is Dangerous and Pernicious to the Soul; (this all Sides confess:) But to believe that the

the Pope can Excommunicate and Depose Kings, absolve their Subjects, from their Oaths of Allegiance, so as they may (†) lawfully murder and kill their Kings so Excommunicated and Deposed, is Heretical and Damnable Doctrine; as is declared in a great and full Parliament (α) on occasion of that horrid and bloody Gun-powder-Treason, in the Fifth year of King James. In the Oath of Allegiance: which Oath, not onely you and I, but all the Clergy, the Nobility, Magistrates, all Graduates in the University, &c. have (or should have) taken, and so (by a Solemn, and Sacred Oath) have Sworn such doctrine to be Impious, Damnable, and Heretical. Other Arguments I need not use to you, (or any who love truth; and the Church of England.) to prove the error and impiety of such Opinions, and the danger those poor deluded Souls are in, who believe and practice them. The πρῶτος ψεύδος, the Original Error, from which the rest follow, is that vast Supremacy, which the Pope (as Peters Successor.) challengeth, and (when he has ability) Usurps over Kings. A power St. Peter never had, nor pretended to; who knew no power in himself, or any other meer Man, superior to Kings. (b) Submit yourselves (sayes he) to every humane Ordinance, whether to the KING AS SUPREME, &c. He who sayes, the KING IS SUPREME, does with the same breath (and undeniable consequence) say, he has no Superior. It being a manifest contradiction, to say, any thing is SUPERIOR to that which is Supreme. St. Peter commands all to SUBMIT themselves to their Kings (and there were none then

but

(†) I say, Lawfully; according to their Popish Principles. For, 1. They say, It is not Treason to kill such a King after deposition, for he is not King then, nor his People (absolved from their Oaths of Fidelity.) Subjects. Nor is it Murder; for their Supreme and infallible Judge, the Pope, has determin'd and made it Law; *NON SUNT HOMICIDÆ, qui adversus Excommunicatos, ZELO MATRIS ECCLESIAE ARMANTUR, EOSQUE TRUCIDANT.* This is the determination of Pope Urban the Second, And it is Law in Gratian, cap. Excommunicatorum 47. Caus. 3. Quest. 5.

(α) I do from my heart abjure and detest, as Impious and Heretical, that Damnable Doctrine and Position; That Princes, that are Excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, may be Deposed or Murdered by their Subjects, or any other. So the Oath in the Statute. 5. Jac. Cap. 4.

(b) 1. Pet. 2. 13. This place troubled Pope Innocent the 3d; and if you will consult and consider his ridiculous, as well as erroneous Exposition of it, you will have reason to think him a Fool, rather than Infallible; and yet it is in their Canon-Law. Cap. Sollicit. 6. Extra De Majoritate & Obediencia.

(†) *Non sunt homicida, qui adversus excommunicatos, zelo matris Ecclesie armantur. Lemma ad dictum. cap. 47. Caus. 23. Quest. 5.*

(a) *Math. 17. 27. Vid. Rob. Abbot. de Suprema potestate Regia Praefat. 4. p. 38.*

(b) *Marc. 12. 17.*

(c) *Dominium non fundatur in gratia, &c.*

(d) *Ὁ δὲν ὑπερῶν τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν Ἀποστόλων, &c. In NOTHING short of the VERY CHIEFEST Apostles. 2 Cor. 11. 5. & 12. ver. 11.*

(e) *Acts 25. 10. 11.*

but Pagan and Idolatrous Princes) and obey them as SUPREME Governors; the Pope commands Subjects to disobey their Kings (if he miscall them Hereticks) to refuse any assistance or subjection to them, to take Armes against them, and tells them, that if (in zeal to the Catholick Cause) they (+) kill them (or any Heretique) it is no Murder: and threatens them with Excommunication, if they do not what he commands them. Now, let any sober person tell me, whether they can (in this case) disobey the Apostle, and obey these impious commands of the Pope, without great and apparent danger to their Soules? Our blessed Saviour (whose Vicar the Pope pretends to be) does himself pay Tribute (a) to Caesar (though a Pagan and Idolater) leaving us an admirable and most pious example of that Obedience and Loyalty due, even to impious and Pagan Princes: nor is this all; for he further gives express command, That all should render unto (b) CAESAR THE THINGS WHICH ARE CAESARS. He acknowledgeth the Imperial Rights of Caesar, of which his Impiety and Idolatry (c) did not deprive him. St. Paul (both by his practice and precept) confirms the same doctrine. 1. He acknowledges the Emperors power superior to his (though he was an Apostle, (d) not inferior to Peter or any Apostle, which he twice affirms to the Corinthians) I stand at Caesars (e) Judgment-Seate (saith he) WHERE I OUGHT TO BE JUDGED; if I have done any thing worthy of DEATH: he pleaded no exemption from the Jurisdiction of the Civil Magistrate, in a Criminal Cause (as now every

(f) Popish

(f.) *Popish Bishop does (as by their Law they may)* but he confesseth the *Superiority of the Civil Power, and Appeals to it* (g) **I APPEAL TO CÆSAR**, (sayes he.) 'Tis evident, that all Appeals are from an Inferior, to a Superior Judge, and one who has Jurisdiction over the Apellant, and cognizance of the crime, and therefore *Paul* appealing to *Cæsar*, does (*ipso facto*) acknowledge him his legal and superior Judge. So far was *St. Paul* from believing those Popish and Rebellious Principles, and from Disloyalty, or Disobedience to that Imperial (though Pagan) Power, under which he lived; that he publicly acknowledged, and humbly submitted to it. 2. Nor was he onely in his own person obedient, and a loyal subject to the Emperor, but (Writing to the *Romans*) he did, as an Apostle of *Jesus Christ*, command them also to be Loyal and Obedient (h) *Let every Soul (every (i) Man) be subject to the higher (the (k) Supreme) Powers, &c.* And then he adds (l) *That they should render to them, TRIBUTE, CUSTOM, FEAR, HONOR, and ALL THEIR DUES.* By *supreme (m) powers* here, he means men possessing Supreme Power; and the Supreme power under which he and the *Romans* then were, was *Nero*, a most impious Pagan, and persecuter of *Christ* and *Christians*; and yet every soul within his Empire (even *Peter* as well as *Paul*) was (by the Law of God and the Gospel) to be subject to him, to fear, honor, pay him Tribute and Loyally obey him. As, (by the before-said Examples and precepts of *St. Paul*, and our blessed Saviour) evidently appears. Now your *Popish Doctrine*, and (by them

(f) Concil. Tridentinum. Sess. 24. Cap. 5. *De Reformatione.*

(g) Aft. 25. 11. vid. R. Abbott *De suprema potestate*. Regia Prælect. 60. pag. 60. 61.

(h) Rom. 13. 1.

(i) Gen. 46. 27. Levit. 22. 3. 6. 11.

(k) ὑπερῶντας, *suprema* 1 Pet. 2. 13. It is the same word in *Peter* and *Paul* too.

(l) Rom. 13. 7.

(m) For ἡγεῖας, *Verf. 1* are Ἀρχόντες, *Verf. 3.* and Διδασκὰς τῷ Θεῷ, *Verf. 4.*

(n) See the place before-cited, Cap. *Solicite*, 6. Extrâ *De Major. & Obedient.* where Pope Innocent the Third says, That the Papal Power is greater than the Imperial, as much as the Sun is greater than the Moon. The Gloss there says; He is 47 times greater; The Note in the Margent says 57 times; but (upon mature consideration, no doubt) The Addition there, says the Papal Power is 7744. times greater than the Imperial.

(o) *Præcipimus universis subditis, ne illi ejusve mandatis aut legibus audeant obedire, qui secus egerint, Anathematis sententia innodamus.* Ita Bulla Pii 5, de Damnat. Elizab. Anno 1570, Eliz. 13. In Bullario Romano. Lugd. 1655. Tom. 2. p. 303. Sometimes they are forbid in such Bulls; *Ne consilium, Fuvamen Operæ, Operamve aliquatenus impendant Regi deposito.* So in the deposition of the Emperor *Frédérique* the Second. In Bullario dicto. Tom. 1. p. 106. Col. 1.

them) *Approved Principles* contradicts all this; and let St. Peter, Paul and our blessed Saviour say, or do what they will; let them acknowledge *Cæsars Supreme Power*, and command obedience to him (though a Pagan) and submit to his power themselves; yet at Rome, they acknowledge NO SUPREME POWER but the POPE; whom (as I have before (n) shew'd) they make vastly superior, and greater then Kings; so that (when he thinks fit) he may depose a King, or Supreme Prince, and command their Subjects (upon pain of Excommunication, and an Anathema) to pay them no Tribute, Fear, or Honor, nor (o) OBEY ANY OF THEIR COMMANDS: For such is the stile of their Anathema's and Damnatory Bulls, particularly of that, wherein Pope Pius the Fifth deposeth Q. Elizabeth, quoted in the Margent. This premised, as evidently certain; be you judge, whether it be not a great crime and crying sin, for any subjects to believe this rebellious and Popish doctrine, against the express command of our blessed Saviour and his Apostles in the Gospel? And if it be (as undeniably it is) then it is as certain, that the belief and practice of such doctrine and principles, is not onely dangerous, but (without repentance) pernicious and damnable to those miserably deluded Souls, who do so believe and practice it.

And it is considerable, and undeniably certain, that their Popish Doctrine, and received principles, do not onely approve the Excommunication and Deposition of Kings, the Absolution of their Subjects from their Oathes of Allegiance, their Prohibition of them to obey the Laws or Commands of their Princes so deposed, that

that they *may take Arms*, and innocently Kill all Heretiques, (Princes or People.) But they are encouraged to do this, (by their Popes Decretals, approved and received (p) for Law, in the Body of their Canon-Law, in the last, and (as they say) the most correct Editions of that Law, approved and established by the Bull and Authority of Gregory the Thirteenth) with the Promise of Heaven and Eternal Life, if they die in the War against the Enemies of the Roman Faith, Heretiques and Infidels. This was a fair promise; but Pope Innocent the Third, (Popes having for some Ages been liberal in promising what they had no power to give) promises more; for besides a Plenary Remission of Sins, he promises, not only Heaven, but a (q) greater degree of Glory in it, to the Crusado's, the Crucifignati, Soldiers marked with a Cross: who (as it was pretended) were raised, to recover the Holy Land from the Saracens; but they, or some with the like indulgence, imploy'd to Murder the poor (r) Waldenses, which with barbarous and inhumane cruelty they did. Now how dangerous to the Soul, Sin so encourag'd must be, a weak-sighted Man may easily see, without Spectacles or further proof. Be it concluded then; such Popish Principles (when believ'd and practis'd) are not only dangerous to the Soul, but pernicious, and (without repentance) destructive of Salvation.

2. But, besides that such Popish Doctrines and Principles (in point of Conscience) are dangerous to the Soul, and (without true repentance) destructive

(p) Vid. Gratian. Can. Omnium 46. Caus. 23. Quæst. 5. & ibid. Can. Omni timore 9. Quæst. 8. Vid. Glossam & Turcrematam ad dictos Canones.

(q) Vid. Bullam Innocenti 3. dat. Laterani 19. Cal. Jan. Anno Pontificat. 18. & Anno Dom. 1215. Mag. Bullarii Roman. Tom. 1. pag. 89. Sect. 17. dictæ Bullæ. Nos ideo (they are the words of the Bull) Omnibus—PLENAM peccatorum OMNIUM VENIAM indulgemus, & in retributione Justorum SALUTIS ETERNÆ POLLICEMUR AUGMENTUM. And all this extravagant Power of pardoning all their sins, and giving higher degrees of glory in Heaven; this (as is pretended) Infallible Judge, erroneously and ridiculously builds upon the power of binding and loosing, which every Apostle had as well, and as much as Peter, and every Bishop in the World, as much as the Pope.

(r) Catholici, qui crucis assumpto charactere, ad Hæreticorum exterminium se accinxerint, illa gaudeant Indulgentia, quæ accedentibus ad Terram Sanctam subsidium conceditur. Concil. Lateran. sub Innocent. 3. Can. 3. Vid. dictum Leonis Papæ 4. apud Gratianum Can. Omni timore 9. Caus. 33. Quæst. 8.

of *Salvation* ; they are also (if consider'd in *Civil Prudence*) dangerous and *pernicious* to *Princes*, and *Supreme Powers* ; depriving them (when put in execution) of all their *Honors*, *Estates*, and *Lives* too. The truth of this is (without further proof) notorious, by the sad and miserable Ruines of many great Princes, caus'd by Popes and their Party, who approv'd and practic'd such *Rebellious Popish Principles*, as we are speaking of. I say, the ruine of great Princes.

1. Before the Reformation, (who were no Protestants) and some since, who were Papists too.

2. Since the Reformation, who were indeed Protestants, or as such (or favorers of them) Excommunicated, and deprived of their Crowns and Kingdoms ; though the Excommunications did prove *bruta fulmina*, vain and ineffectual, and did not that mischief, which their impious Author intended : for which we are to thank the good Providence of Heaven, and not the Pope.

(f) And a little before him, Pope Gregory 2. Deposed the Emperor *Leo Isaurus*, because he was against Images, which was Anno 729. Vid. Baron. Annal. ad Annum 730. Num. 5. Where he has this Note concerning that Emperors Deposition :---*Sic exemplum posteris DIGNUM reliquit Gregorius ; ne in Ecclesia Christi REGNARE SINE REKTORIBUS HÆRETICI PRINCIPES.* The Cardinal every where highly approves this Doctrine, &c. Vid. Baron. ad Ann. 593. Num. 86.

1. For the first ; Authentique Stories tell us, that Pope (f) *Zachary* Deposed *Childerick* (or *Chilperick*) King of *France*, about the middle of the Eighth Century. 2. *Gregory the Seventh* Deposeth *Henry the Fourth*, and causeth great and miserable Rebellions and Bloodshed in the Roman Empire, in the Eleventh Century. 3. Pope *Sylvester the Third*,

Third, in the Twelfth Century, Excommunicates the Emperor *Henry the Fifth*, *Et Magnus turbas in Germania excitat* (says *Urspergensis*.) 4. Pope *Innocent the Third* Excommunicates *Otto the Fourth*, in the beginning of the Thirteenth Century. 5. *Innocent the Fourth*, in the same Century, Deposed the Emperor *Frederick the Second*. In short, (to omit many others) the barbarous Murders of *Henry the Third and Fourth of France*, have been, and most justly were, and will be imputed to these Popish Principles, in the belief of which, those impious Assassins were confirm'd and Catechiz'd. Sure I am, that Pope *Sixtus the Fifth* did approve and highly magnifie the impious Fact of *Jaques Clement the Dominican*, who was the Murderer of *Henry the Third*, in that famous (and impious) (t) Speech of his, made to his Cardinals (no doubt as well pleased as the Pope) in the Consistory; and afterwards Publish'd and Printed at *Rome*: An evident Argument, that they were not (though great reason they should have been) asham'd of it: for certainly they would never have Printed what they did not approve.

(t) This Speech of *Sixtus 5.* was Printed at *Pavia*, An. 1589. according to the Latin Copy printed at *Rome*, as is attested by three Doctors of the *Sorbon*.

2. But although the Popish Positions and Principles we are speaking of, are dangerous to all Supreme Powers, (even Roman Catholiques, as appears by what is already said) yet more especially to all Protestant Princes and People: For,

1. All Protestant (*Kings and Subjects*) being declared *Heretiques*, are Excommunicated, and

(a) The form of that Excommunication is now extant in the Body of their Law, lib. 7. Decret. lib. 5. Tit. 3. De Hæreticis & Schism. cap. 9.

(b) The Bull of Excommunication is dated at Rome, An. 1558. which was 1 Elizabethæ.

(c) Quæcunque dignitat, etiam Comitalli, Baronali, Marchionali, Ducali, Regia, seu Imperiali præfulgeant.

(d) Quicunque HACTENUS à fide deviarunt, seu INPOSTERUM deviabunt, seu in Hæresin incident, &c.

(e) Habitâ cum Card. deliberatione matura, & de eorum Consilio, & Unanimi assensu, &c.

(f) Omnes Suspensionis, Excommunicationis, Interdicti, Privationis pœnas, à QUIBUSVIS Rom. Pontificibus, aut pro TALIBUS HABITIS, per eorum literas Extravagantes, seu in Consiliis seu Patrum Decretis & Canonibus QUOMODOLIBET contra Hæreticos Latas, approbamus, innovamus, & PERPETUO OBSERVARI Volumus, &c.

(g) Régis & Imperio PENITUS & IN TOTUM, PERPETUO sint PRIVATI, & ad illa de cætero inhabiles. & INCAPACES, &c.

solemnly (a) Cursed by Pope Paul the Fourth, about 120 years ago; and that we may take notice of it, it is lately referr'd into the Body (b) of their Canon-Law. Now this Excommunication contains many considerable particulars, As, 1. All Heretiques, of what dignity (c) soever, Barons, Earls, Marquesses, Dukes, Kings, and Emperors: none excepted, they are all involved in the same Curse and Anathema. 2. Nor is it onely those Heretiques who then were in being, but ALL also, which (d) AFTERWARDS SHOULD BE. So that our gracious King and his Protestant subjects now, are as much under the Curse, as Q. Elizabeth and her subjects were, in the First of her Reign, when that Bull was first publish'd. 3. Nor was this Bull rashly made, but after (e) mature deliberation with the Cardinals, and by their Counsel, and unanimous consent. It was (it seems) a premeditated and deliberate, as well as an Impious Act they were about; for impious it was, and by all sober and impartial Judges, ever will be thought so. 4. The punishments which this Bull ties upon Heretiques, are (f) Excommunication, Suspension, Deprivation, and all other punishments, which any Pope, in any Papal Canon or Constitution (howsoever made) denounced against Heretiques; all which Canons and Constitutions he approves, confirms, and will have PERPETUALLY observed. 5. And for Kings (g) and Emperors (the same is for Barons, Earls, Marquisses,

Marquisses and Dukes) they are **TOTALLY** and **FOR EVER DEPRIVED** of their Kingdomes and Empires, and made incapable ever to enjoy them. The same Censure passeth upon Bishops, Archbishops, which were *Heretiques then*, when the Curse was publish'd, (*vel in posterum in Haresin incident*) or for the future **EVER SHOULD BE** Heretiques. Nor is this Constitution (which denounceth this Curse) temporary; But **CONSTITUTIO IN PERPETUUM VALITURA**, a Constitution and a Curse to be in force, and effectual against Heretiques, for ever. Nor is there any need, of any Legal Process to convict any person of Heresie, before the Curse come upon him: but, **EO IPSO ABSQUE ALIQUO JURIS VEL FACTI MINISTERIO** (they are the words of this impious Excommunication) All Heretiques, by being so, without any accusation, or legal conviction, are actually under that curse: So that our gracious King, all his Protestant Nobility, all Archbishops and Bishops, *Eorum etiam* (b) *receptatores, fautores*, &c. and all who shall receive, or any way favor them, stand actually Excommunicated and Accursed. And here I desire to know of our Papists, who do (as much as any) pretend to Loyalty; do they (as good subjects should) favor their King, or do they not? If not, then they neither are, nor can be good subjects: If they do, then they disobey their Supreme and Infallible Judges, and are (as well as we) under

(b) Vid. Constit. 34. Clementis Papæ 10. which next follows, & Alexandri 7. Constit. 16. dat. Romæ, Anno 1656. In Bullario Romano, Tom. 4. p. 218. where we are referred to many more such forms of Excommunications.

den the Excommunication and the Popes Curse, (and so no members of their so much (and with so little reason) magnify'd Roman Church.

But lest this Excommunication and Curse might not prove so effectual as they desire, to blast all Protestants (which they make, for they are not so, the worst of all Heretiques) the Curse, to make Sure Work (as they think, and would have it) is solemnly renewed every

(a) A Form of this Bull we have in Bullar. Roman. Tom. 4. p. 528. Constit. 34. Clement. 10. An. 1671.

(b) *Excommunicamus & Anathematizamus, ex parte Dei, & auctoritate Petri & Pauli, ac nostra, quoscunque Hussitas, Wickliffistas, Lutheranos, Zwinglianos, Calvinistas, Ugonottos, &c. Eorumque receptatores, fautores, & defensores.*

year, in that famous (and impious) Bulla (a) *Cenæ Domini*, read every year on Maundy-Thursd. Wherein all Protestants are (by name) curs'd, whether Princes or People.

We (b) *Excommunicate and Curse* (says the Pope in that Bull) *All Hussites, Wickliffists, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Hugonots, &c. And whosoever shall RECEIVE, DEFEND, or FAVOR them.*

And here again, it will concern our Roman Catholics seriously to consider, into what straits, the ambition and unparallel'd pride of their Popes, has brought them.

For if (according to their duty) they defend their King, they are *curs'd at Rome*. And if they do not defend him, then they do not perform that duty of Allegiance and Fidelity to their King, to which (by the Law of God and Nature) they are indispensably bound, and so will be (according to their desert) *accurs'd in Heaven*. And here, It is a short Question which they are concern'd to Answer;

Whether

Whether they resolve to obey God, or the Pope.

3. But this is not all; for after this Excommunication and Curse laid upon all Protestant Princes, after their deposition and total deprivation of all their royal power and dignity, and a perpetual incapacity brought upon them, disabling them for ever to return to those lost rights: another Curse is consequent, and immediately follows such Excommunication: Their Subjects are declared free from all Obligations of Loyalty and Fidelity, due to such Princes, while they stand Excommunicate. This the Decretal of Pope (c) Honorius the Third, (and 'tis made (d) Law by Pope Gregory the Ninth, and approved and confirmed by Pope (e) Gregory the Thirteenth) tells us, That while any (f) Lord remains Excommunicate, his **SUBJECTS OWE HIM NO ALLEGIANCE or FIDELITY**. That's the Title: and then it follows in the Decretal, (speaking of a Count who was Excommunicate) that the Pope commands those to whom he writes, That they should (g) declare to the Subjects of that Excommunicate Count, that they were **FULLY ABSOLVED FROM THEIR OATH OF FIDELITY** while their Lord continued Excommunicate. How dangerous this Doctrine may be, to our Gracious King, and all Protestant Princes, (who stand actually Excommunicated at Rome) and how little trust they can repose in their Popish Subjects, I need not tell

you :

(c) Honorius 3. Præposito Archidiacon. & H. Canonico Suffraganeo.

(d) Cap. Gravem, 13. Extra De Penit.

(e) In Bulla, Corp. Juris Can. præfixa.

(f) Domino Excommunicato Manente, **SUBDITI FIDELITATEM NON DEBENT**. So the Lemma, or Title of that 13 Chapter.

(g) *Fideles ipsius (quoad in Excommunicatione persistunt) ab ejus FIDELITATIS FO-RAMENTO denunciatis PE-NITUS ABSOLUTOS*. They are the words of the Law; and if you consult the Gloss and Gard. Thyracramata's Commentary upon it, you may find more to that Purpose.

you : Seeing *such subjects* , by their *Authentique laws* , and the *declared and definitive sentence of their supreme and Infallible Judge* , are *assured that they owe no Allegiance or Fidelity to their Excommunicated Sovereigns*.

4. Nor is this all; for there is (at least in the judgment and belief of our Adversaries) a far greater and more pernicious consequent and effect of their Excommunication and Curse of Protestant Princes. For the mischiefs of their Excommunications hitherto mention'd , are onely temporal , (though the greatest in that kind possible) as loss of their Royal Power, Liveliness, and Life it self. But they say, there is an other, a Spiritual effect, which concerns the Soul , and is the greatest mischief and misery it is capable of. For they say, that Heretiques (Protestants, with them are declared such) dying Excommunicate, (as all good Protestants do) are eternally damn'd. For, 1. A very great (h) Canonist of our own Nation (while Popery unhappily prevailed here) tells us ; that every Excommunicated person is a MEMBER OF THE DEVIL : And for further proof of this , he cites Gratian, and the (i) Canon-Law. And a far greater Author than Lindewood, or Gratian, and (in our dayes) long after them , more plainly tells us : (a) that Pope Gregory the Seventh did not onely depose the Emperor Henry the Fourth, but Excommunicate , and DECREE HIM TO BE ETER-

(h) Excommunicatus est MEMBRUM DIABOLI. Lindewood in Glossa, ad Cap. Seculi Principes. Verbo Reconciliationis. De Immunitate Ecclesie.

(i) Gratian. Can. Omnis Christianus 32. Caus. 11. Quæst. 3.

(a) Non modo deponi, sed etiam excommunicari, & in ÆTERNO EXAMINE DAMNARI DECREVIT. Baron. Annal. Tom. 8. ad Annum Christi 593. Num. 86.

PERPETUALLY DAMN'D. And for this, he cites Pope Gregorius own (b) *Epistles*; who best knew his own mind, and the meaning of his own Decree. So that in the Popes and Cardinals Judgment such an Excommunication is a definitive sentence, and a Papal Decree; whereby the persons Excommunicate are consign'd and doom'd to *Eternal Damnation*. Whence we may understand the meaning of the Titles usually prefix'd to such Damnatory Bulls of Excommunication; such as these, (c) ... **DAMNATIO & Excommunicatio** Hen. 8. by Pope Paul the Third, (d) **DAMNATIO & Excommunicatio Elizabetha**, by Pius the Fifth, where it seems, (by what the Pope and Cardinal before told us) that it is not any temporal, (or not that only) but the *eternal damnation* of Soul and Body, which is intended and desired by them, in their uncharitable and impious Anathemas and Excommunications. Whence also it manifestly follows; that all Protestants, Kings and Subjects, Princes and People, (who, by many Papal Bulls and Anathemas, stand actually Cursed and Excommunicated) are in a damnable condition, and if they die, (as they do, and should) without Popish Absolution, by this Roman, Uncharitable, and Unchristian Divinity, they are eternally damn'd. This I say, not that I think such Papal Bulls and Excommunications either have, or can have any such effects, or bring such danger to Protestants (Kings or Subjects) as is pretend-

K

ed;

(b) Gregorius 7. lib. 4. Epist. 2. & 23. & lib. 8. Epist. 21.

(c) Bullario Roman. Pauli. 3. Constit. 7. p. 704. Tom. 1. in Magno Bullario Romano Lugduni, 1655.

(d) Constit. Pii 5. 101. Ibidem. Tom. 2. p. 303. Edit. 1655.

ed ; for I believe and know, that they are *bruta fulmina*, insignificant Squibs of false Fire ; which can neither hurt their Souls here, nor hinder their Salvation hereafter. But notwithstanding this, they may prove dangerous and pernicious to Protestant Princes, as they may be, and are great encouragements to their Popish Subjects, to rebel, and disobey their Sovereigns, and securely (as to any thing of Conscience or Injustice in it) act any thing to their ruine. For they who believe the Popes pretended Power, that he can deprive their Prince of all Royal Power and Dignity, and that he has actually done it ; that he has absolved them from all Obligations of Allegiance and Fidelity due to him ; that he is a Member of the Devil here, and surely to be damn'd hereafter, and that to kill him is no Murder. I say, those who submit to the Pope, and believe these Erroneous and Impious Doctrines, (as all must who believe the Pope, or the Roman Church Infallible) have too much encouragement, not only to disobey and rebel, but (when they have power and opportunity) to take away their Princes Life, as being a Person odious to God and Man, and by the Pope, (their Infallible and Supreme Judge) by their approved Laws, and their General Councils, declared to be such ; especially seeing that if they miscarry in that attempt, (and while they seek their Princes Life, lose their own) yet
their

their Names shall (in Red Letters) be Registered in the Calendar, and they (by their Party) shall be reputed Martyrs; as all know, that *Campion*, *Garner*, and our Powder-Traytors are. An honor, I am so far from envying them, that I should be very glad (and so would many thousands more) to see our present Conspirators (according to their merit) referr'd into their Calendar amongst such Martyrs; that so we might be freed from the fears of those Prodigious Villains and mischiefs they intended and indeavoured to act here, against their Gracious Sovereign, the Church and State, and there is too much reason to believe, that (while they live, and have ability and opportunity) they will prosecute those Black Designs. *Dirum omen misericors (qui solus potest) averruncet Deus.*

These are the known Positions and Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, approved and received by the Supreme Authority of that Church; which (in *Theſi*) when they are believ'd, may be very dangerous, and when (in *Praxi*) put in execution, (and they who believe such impious Doctrines, act accordingly) pernicious to all Kings, Princes, and People, especially Heretiques (as they miscall them) who imbrace not all their Popish Errors, in which number all Protestants (Kings and Subjects) are, by them, always included. And that the *Popish Party*, (especially *Jesuits*) since their unhappy appearing in the (a) *World*, as also their *Ecclesiastiques*

(4) The Order of the Jesuits was approved and Instituted by Pope Paul the Third, Anno 1540. and highly encouraged by succeeding Popes. Vide Bullarium Romanum Lugduni 1655. Tom. 1. p. 738.

Secular and Regular, (with their adherents) have acted according to those Principles, for some Ages last past, and what Barbarous Murders, Depositions of Princes, and Fatal Tragedies, have been the sad consequences of such belief and actings, both our own, and Forreign Historians abundantly testify. And here,

1. I shall pass by the horrid Murders and Massacres of the poor *Waldenses*; who (upon prosecution of the foresaid Principles) have been persecuted with Fire and Sword, Armies (b) and Inquisitions; and very many thousands (nay, *infinite numbers*) of them, (as some of their own Writers testify) have been *inhumanely murdered, Causa indicta & inaudita*, (many times) especially in *France*, to say nothing of other Countries.

(b) Vid. Matth. Paris ab Anno 1100, & *Historiam Waldensum*; *Directorium Inquisitorum*; *Historiam Inquisitionis, Armachanum, De statu & successu Eccles.* &c. That *Directorium Inquisitorum* (I mean) was Writ by Nic. Mymericus, Printed at Venice. 1607.

2. I desire you to consider that *Barbarous and prodigious Villany*, the great Massacre of *Protestants in France*, Ann. 1572. where and when above 30, or 40000. (†) *Innocent Protestants* (in *Paris*, and other parts of *France*) were suddenly and *inhumanely Murdered*, by *Papists* acting upon such *Popish Principles*, as I have before mentioned. And this Horrid Villany was so far from being *publickly disapproved* and *damm'd*. by the *Church of Rome*, or the *Impious Actors* punish'd; that the news of it was received at *Rome* with great Joy, (c) and giving Thanks to God for it, (*Quasi auctor & consors*

(†) *Abrege Chronologique &c.* par le Sieur de Mezeray, Paris. 1567. Tom. 3. p. 1082. 1086. ad Annum. 1572.

(c) This testify'd by *Thuanus* (a faithful Historian) Hist. lib. 53. ad Annum 1372. p. 837. Edit. 1620. and by *Fam. Strada.* de Bello Belgico. lib. 7. p. 373. Editionis Romæ, 1648.

consors sceleris fuisse Deus) nor was it so at Rome only, but in other places too, Papists received that news with great joy. An evident argument that they approved both that Impious Doctrine, and the pernicious effects of it.

3. To omit the many Seditions and Rebellions in the time of Henry the Eighth, (after he had deny'd the Popes Supremacy) and Edward the Sixth, (caused by such Persons and Principles) it is notoriously known, that the same Party, in prosecution of the same Principles and Popish-Interest, did (in the Reign of Q. Elizabeth) continually conspire, and endeavour to take (*) away the life of that good Queen, by Poison, Pistol, and such other impious (and to persons of such Principles, usual) ways of Assassination; to raise Rebellions and Armies (having the Popes Assistance and Blessing to encourage them to that Villany) to destroy her and her Religion. And when all this would not do, (Heav'n Blessing, what Rome Impiously Curs'd) Pope Pius the Fifth (d) gives the Kingdoms of England and Ireland to Philip the Second King of Spain, and he (with the Popes Assistance and Blessing) sends his (as he and his Holiness imagin'd) Invincible Armado, to take possession; But that vast Armado, and the Popish Impious Design, were utterly defeated; not so much by the Queens Fleet, (which was very inconsiderable) as by great storms and tempests,

(*) Vid. Speed's Chron. in Q. Eliz. Ann. 1584. of Dr. Parries design'd Assassination of the Queen, by the Incouragement of the Jesuits, Card. de Como, and the Pope, promising a Plenary Indulgence, for that (as they call'd it) meritorious Act. See the like attempt of Ed. Squire to poison the Queen, on the like incouragement, in Speed in Vita Eliz. p. 1263. num. 122.

(d) In depositione Elizabethæ Angliæ Regina, Pius 5. fuit Britannia & Hibernia, ad Philippum 2 Hispaniæ Regem translata, cuius donationis, demandatus postea Sidonius fuit Anno 1588. Classe Hispanicâ instructus ut regna Britannia possideret. Remonstrant. Hibernorum per fratrem. Rob. Caroa Part. 1. cap. 3. Sect. 4. p. 7.

pests, the immediate Hand of Heaven, and a most Gracious and Miraculous Providence : And this was so evident, that the Admiral of that Armado (the Duke of Medina Sidonia) blasphemously swore, That he feared Jesus Christ was turned Lutheran. But Philip King of Spain, (hearing of the strange defeat and ruine of his Fleet, and seeing the Hand of Heaven in it) said more soberly, That he did not send his Fleet to fight against God, (to whose Power and Providence, he attributed the loss of it) but against Men.

4. The Queen being dead, *Popish Conspiracies* did not die with her; the Pope and his Party continue as industrious and (as to their Designs and Plots) as impious as before. They saw and knew, that King James (a Protestant) was Legal Successor and Heir to the Crown of England, yet used all Roman Arts, to hinder his having possession of it; and to this end, Father Parsons (the Jesuite) writes a Book, to prove (what was evidently untrue, and he could not chuse but know it) That King JAMES had no just Title to the Crown of England; though the whole Right of the Saxons and Normans, and of the Houses of York and Lancaster, were intirely and evidently united in him:) But when these Popish and Jesuitical Arts prevailed not, (having neither true Reason or Religion to further their Designs, which were impious and irrational)

nal) they contrive, and resolve to execute such a
Conspiracy, as (for barbarous and prodigious
Villany) neither Heathens nor Hell had (till
that time) ever put in execution; I mean the
(a) Gun-Powder-Treason, which was not any
ordinary or before-known Wickedness; (as
the Killing a King, or Poysoning a Prince, &c.)
but a black and unparallell'd Villany, worthy
Rome and a Jesuite; the Blowing up of a whole
Parliament, King, Lords and Commons, the
Murdering of a Kingdom in its Representatives,
and this in a moment; before they could see,
or dream of any danger. But though this (for
its impiety) was a prodigious Conspiracy, carried
on with sworn secrecie, and lay hid, in the dark,
and under ground; yet there is no Power or
Policy against Providence, nor concealing any
thing from the All-seeing Eye of our God; He
saw, and gratioussly discover'd that horrid, Po-
pish-Powder-Treason, to the Preservation of
his People, the Confusion of their Adversaries, and
(*nisi perisset pudor*) if they had any, to the
Eternal Shame of Papists, and (Popery) their
Religion, which approves and encourages such
abominable Impieties.

(a) See the Act of Parlia-
ment 3. Jacobi, Cap. 4. where
we are told (by the Parliament)
of the HELLISH Conspiracies
of the Jesuites and Seminary
Priests. For a more particu-
lar Narrative of the horrid
Powder-Plot, you may consult
an ingenious Tract, called
THE HISTORY OF THE
GUNPOWDER-TREASON;
and those Authors out of
which he collected it, in the
last page of that Tract; and
the Authentique History of the
Trial of those Traitors, now
in the Press, and Re-printing.

When King James slept with his Fathers,
and was translated to a better Kingdom, out
of the reach of such Popish Conspirators, and
whither (without a serious and timely repen-
tance of such inhumane Villanies) they can
never come, their Designs slept not; they pro-
secute

(b) This Jesuitical and Popish Plot was discovered by *Andreas ab Habernfeld*, to Sir *W. Boswell*, our Ambassador at the *Hague*, and by him to the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, after whose death the Original was found in the Archbishops Library, and then printed: and is lately reprinted under this Title, *The Grand Design of Popishists in the Reign of CHARLES the First*, &c. London, 1678. where you have an authentick discovery of that (I cannot call it worse) Jesuitical Conspiracy.

secure their Plots and Conspiracies, (to ruine our Church and establish'd Religion) as much in *Charles the First's*, as in his Fathers time. And at last it came to this issue, that (other means failing) the King (b) and the Archbishop of *Canterbury* must be made away. This was conceived the likeliest means to compass their Ends, and bring in that Religion *they miscal Catholique and Christian*. For certainly such barbarous Murders and Assassinations may possibly promote Turcism, and the Errors of *Mahomet*, (and if you will, Popery) but never were (nor can be) any just means to propagate true Christianity. This Traiterous Conspiracy to Murder *Charles the First*, and the Archbishop, &c. was discovered (by an honorable Person) to the English Ambassador in *Holland*, and (by him) to the Archbishop, and by him, to the King. And the Original Copy of the Discovery, being found in the Archbishop's Library, after his death, was then publish'd, and is in Print, in many hands, and (amongst others) in mine. In the mean time, our unhappy Civil Wars began; and our Popish Conspirators, (animated by a belief of such Rebellious Doctrines and Principles, as I have before mentioned, and encouraged and assisted by the Pope) are first in Arms, and the bloody Rebellion; and (in *Ireland*) murdered above 100000 Protestants in cold blood, without any provocation given, but to kill Heretiques, (which according to their impious and

land erroneous Principles, was lawful and meritorious) and thereby promote the Catholique Cause. This is notoriously known to both Kingdoms, (England and Ireland.) And further, when in the process of that fatal Rebellion, (carried on openly by English, and covertly by Popish Rebels) that good King was taken, imprison'd, with design to bring His Sacred Head to the Block, (for the distance is seldom great between a Princes Prison and His Grave) our Popish Conspirators had a Council of Priests and Jesuites, which sat in London, and signifi'd the condition of their Affairs here, to a Council of their Confederates at Paris, and they transmitted the (b) Case to Rome, from whence Directions and Commands were return'd (by the same way) back again to London. In short, it was determin'd, that it was for the Interest of the Catholick Cause, that the King should die; and accordingly their Council of Priests and Jesuites in London Voted His Death. This is now Notoriously known to be true, and (in Print) publish'd to the (a) World, by a Reverend and Learned Person, who, (if any shall call him to an account for it) is so convinc'd of the truth of what he writ, that he (in scriptis) publicly offers, and promises to make it good. I do not hear, that he has (as yet) been call'd to any account, to prove what he publicly, and in Print, has profess'd and promised to do: Nor do I think, he will be call'd to any such account, because I have

L

reason

(b) The Question put to the Sorbon (then almost wholly Jesuited) by our English Jesuites, sent from London, was (in Writing) this: — *That seeing the State of England was in a likely posture to change the Government, whether it was lawful for the Catholiques to work that change, for the advancing and securing the Catholick Cause in England, BY MAKING AWAY THE KING, whom there was no hope to turn from his Heresie?* The Answer of the Sorbon was Affirmative. And at Rome it was resolved by the Pope and his Council, That it was both LAWFUL and EXPEDIENT for the Catholiques to procure that Alteration of State, &c. Dr. Du Moulin in his Book next cited.

(a) By Dr. Du Moulin in his Answer to *Philanax Anglicus*, (a Popish scandalous and lying Pamphlet) and in another Tract since; neither of which I have here, and so cannot cite (as in Books about me I do) the particular Pages.

reason to believe, that he can, and will produce such Proofs, as will evidently demonstrate, both their bloody Conspiracies, and the undeniable truth of what he affirm'd.

6. By the Premises it may sufficiently appear, That the Rebellious Popish Principles and Practices have been very dangerous to all our Protestant Princes, and their Loyal Subjects, ever since the Reformation; and had they taken that effect, which they designed, and with unwearied wickedness industriously endeavour'd, they would have proved destructive and (both to Prince and People pernicious. Nay, (which I have omitted) while this whole Nation continued actually in the Communion of the Church of Rome; when *Henry the Eighth* his Parliament and Convocation (all Roman-Catholiques, and far from being Protestants) had deny'd and (*lege* (b) *latâ*) taken away the *Popes Usurped Supremacy*, (that we may be sure the Pope's Practices are suitable to his pernicious Principles) *Pope Paul the Third*, *Excommunicates*, *Curses*, and (c) *Damns the King*, and all his *Good Subjects*; *Commands* him to (d) *Abrogate and Null the Laws* made against his Supremacy; and to appear *before him* at (e) *Rome* within *Ninety Days*; and his *Adherents and Favourers*, (which were all his Loyal Subjects, especially his Parliament and Convocation) within *Sixty Days*. They not appearing, he *Ratifies the Excommunication*, (f) *Deprives*

(b) Statut. 24. Hen. 8. cap. 12. & 25. Hen. 8. cap. 19, 20, 21.

(c) *Damnatio & Excommunicatio Hen. 8. ejusque factorum & complicum, &c.* That's the Title prefix'd to the Bull of his Excommunication, in Bullario Romano Lugd. 1655. Tom. 1. p. 704.

(d) *Requirimus quatenus Hen. Rex Leges prædictas revocet, caset, anulet.* Dist. Bullæ. Sect. 4.

(e) *Stricte præcipiendo mandamus, quatenus Hen. Rex per se, vel procuratorem infra 90. dies, factores vero, & ei adherentes infra 60. dies compareant coram NOBIS.* Ibid. Sect. 7.

(f) *Hen. Regem, privationis Regni & Dominiorum penas incurrisse declaramus.* Ibid.

prives him of his Kingdom and Dominions; Prohibits peremptorily the (g) King or his Adherents (if they die, as they did before he Absolved them) to have any CHRISTIAN BURIAL, and declares them ETERNALLY DAMN'D. Then he layes that most impious Interdict upon the whole (h) Nation; forbids all Publick Prayers, (i) Masses, and Divine Offices. Nor this only; but he Deprives the Children of Henry the Eighth, (k) Born, or to be Born of Queen Anna, and all the Children of his Adherents, and their Descendents, (none excepted) of all their Rights, Priviledges, and Goods, Moveable and Immoveable, and makes them (for the future) incapable, and deprived of all Dignities, Honors, Offices, Rights, Fees, &c. which otherwise they might have obtain'd, and this he does knowingly, and by the Plenitude of his Power. Then he goes on, and declares the King and his Adherents, and Descendents, to be Infamous Persons, disabled to be Witnes, to make any Will or Testament, or to receive any Legacy or Benefit by the Testament of any other: (l) Forbids all Men to have any Conversation, Commerce, or Trade with them, on pain of Excommunication, and loss of all their Goods, &c. And further, Commands all Christian (m) Princes, (quacunque dignitate Imperiali aut Regali fulgeant) Kings and Emperors, no way to favour the King and his Adherents, and (n) Nulls all Oaths, Compacts, Treaties, &c. (made, or to be made) to or with

(g) Si interim ab humanis decedant, Ecclesiastica debere carere sepultura, auctoritate et potestatis plenitudine decernimus, eoque Anathematis, maledictionis, et DAMNATIONIS ATERNAE mucrone percusimus, Ibid.

(h) Henrici Dominia, Civitates, &c. Interdicto supponimus. Ibid. Sect. 8.

(i) Nequeant Missae, aut alia Divina officia celebrari. Ibid.

(k) Omnes Hen. Regis ex Anna, ac singulorum ejus Adherentium filios, natos et nascituros, aliosque descendentes (nemine excepto) honoribus dignitatibus, bonis mobilibus et immobilibus, &c. privatos et ad illa aut alia obtinenda inhabiles esse, declaramus ac auctoritate, scientia ac plenitudine similibus inhabilitamus. Ibid. Sect. 9.

(l) Omnes sub Excommunicationis ac aliis penis monemus, ut prafatos maledictos ac privatos evitent, & quantum in eis est, ab aliis evitari faciant: nec cum prafati Regis Dominiorum, Civitatum, &c. subditis aut incolis, emendo, vendendo, &c. quamcunque mercaturam commercium aut communionem habeant, Ibid. Sect. 12.

(m) Omnes Christianos Principes (etiam Imperiali aut Regali dignitate fulgentes) requirimus. Ibid. Sect. 15.

(n) Furamenta confederationes, obligationes, quae Henricum juvare possunt, irritas cassas et inanes decernimus. Ibid.

(a) *Principes & quoscunque alios militantes, per mare vel terras, requirimus, mandantes, quatenus Hen. Regem & ei adhaerentes (dum contra sanctam sedem REBELLIONE permanserint) armis insurgant, eosque persequantur, & ad obediendam dictae sedis redire cogant, eorumque bona, navigia, Animalia, &c. Ubilibet (etiam extra territorium Henrici Regis) consistentia, CAPIANT: & sic capta in proprios usus convertendi, auctoritatem concedimus, illaque omnia ad capientes PLENARIE pertinere, & personas, vel ex regno dicto originem trahentes, vel in eo habitantes, mandatis nostris non obtemperantes, ubicunque eos capi contigerit, capiemium SERVOS fieri decernentes. Ibid. Scet. 16. 17.*

the King, or in favour of him or his Adherents; and gives Authority and express COMMAND to all Christian Princes, and their Armies, (by Sea or Land) to turn their Arms against the King and his Adherents, and (a) compel them to return to the Unity of the Church, and Obedience to the Pope. And whoever acknowledges Henry the Eighth to be King, or any way Obeys him, and will not (in Obedience to the Popes Command) expel him and them, out of the Kingdom and their Dominions, all their Goods, (Moveable and Immoveable) Moneys, Merchandizes, (whether within or without England) are to be seiz'd on, and (by the Popes Authority) possess'd and kept by any who can catch them. And he there gives them (such Thieves and Robbers) full power to enjoy and possess such Plunder'd Goods of the Kings or his Loyal Subjects, as in their own Right and Propriety. And if they take any Inhabitants in England, (Native or Alien) who Obey the King, and Disobey the Pope, then all so taken, are to be Slaves to those who take them: So that impious Bull; in contradiction to the Laws of Nature and Scripture, Reason and Christian Religion. Our Blessed Saviour, (the Prince of Peace) came not to destroy, but to save; not to Depose Kings and Emperors, Absolve their Subjects from the Obligations of their Natural or Sworn Allegiance, or to Arm them against Governors, and (as his pretended Vicar does) promise them a Reward (Remission of Sins here, and an higher place

place in Heaven hereafter) for Rebellion, and Murdering their Brethren, Fellow-Subjects and Christians, for believing and maintaining that Truth, which by the Pope and his Party, should be miscall'd Heresie. No, he was the good Shepherd, who laid down his own life for his Sheep; and when they stray'd and err'd from his Fold, he did not hire and send Dogs or Wolves to worry them; but (with infinite Patience and Mercy) went himself to seek them, and being found (though erring and out of his Fold) laid them on his own shoulders, and (with great love and labor) brought them home to his Fold, from which (as his Sheep may, and yet not cease to be his Sheep) they had err'd. We read indeed, that our Blessed Saviour gives Peter Commission to (b) FEED HIS SHEEP and his LAMBS. But we never read that he (whose Kingdom was not of this World) gave any Commission to Peter, or his pretended Vicar, to raise Armies to kill, and (indictâ causâ) to Murder them. Though I know there are some, who from paste oves, (with bad Logique and worse Divinity) conclude, that the Pope has Power to kill Heretiques. Like that Monk Erasmus mentions, who, with great Zeal for the Catholique Cause, and greater Ignorance, endeavoured to prove, that the Church might kill Heretiques, from that passage in the Apostle, (c) HÆRETICUM DEVITA, that is, (says the Monk) (who had no Greek, and little Latine)

(b) Joh. 21. 15, 16.

(c) Tit. 3. 10.

Latine) *DE VITA TOLLE*, take him out of this life, that is, kill him. *Sed è diverticulo in Viam.*

7. From the aforesaid reasons, I think we may (with good consequence) conclude; that the Pope and his party, ever since Henry the Eighth, (*de facto*) assum'd the Supremacy, which (*de jure*) was his before.) have been in a perpetual Conspiracy against the Lives and Religion of our Protestant Princes; at least till the Happy Return of our Gracious Sovereign (whom God preserve) who being (by the good and Miraculous Providence of Heaven Restor'd to His Fathers Throne (His own Right and Inheritance) a blessed Peace, and all the happy effects of it, did immediately follow, to the great comfort and benefit of the whole Nation; The Government of Church and State before shatter'd and ruin'd by a horrid Rebellion (Begun, Incurag'd, and Promoted by the Pope and his Jesuitical Party) was happily Restored; and (by Law) establish'd; the Just Rights and Liberties of the Subjects assured to them, and confirm'd; a Gracious Act of Oblivion, and Pardon of Illegal, Seditious and Rebellious actions against the King and His Laws granted; and the blessing and benefit of all these extended to *Papists* as well as other. So that beside their *Obligation to Obedience and Loyalty*, by their *Natural* or *Sworn Allegiance*, there lay upon them an *Obligation to Gratitude*,

Gratitude, for those *signal favors* they received, from the *goodness of a gracious Prince*. So that it was the *believe and hope of some*, that the foremention'd *Popish Principles and Practises* had been forgot, or laid aside; and that the Roman Catholics (as both in words and writings they publicly pretended) would be very *Loyal Subjects*. But these were vain hopes; for (notwithstanding all obligations to obedience and gratitude) even since His Majesties Happy Return, the Popish Party have carried on their Plots and Conspiracies, against their *gracious Prince*, the *establish'd Religion*, and the *Peace of our Church and State*, with as much industry and impiety, as formerly. Which now evidently appears, by their *impious Conspiracy*, by the blessing of God very happily, though lately discover'd. That you may (in the General) know what this Plot is, and that I do not miscall it, when I say it is an *Impious Conspiracy*: I shall give you two Authentique Testimonies.

I. Our gracious King calls it (a) **A BLOODY TRAITEROUS design of POPISH Recusants, against His MAJESTIES Sacred PERSON, the GOVERNMENT, and the PROTESTANT RELIGION.**

(a) In His Majesties Proclamation, for banishing all Papists, Ten miles from London, Dated, Octob. 30. 1678.

II. The House of Commons (in a Vote of that (b) House, approved by the Lords) say thus Resolved, &c. That this House is of Opinion,

(b) The Votes of the Commons was read to the Lords, and by them approved at a Conference, 1 Nov. 1678.

Opinion, that there **HATH BEEN, and STILL IS, a DAMNABLE, and HELLISH PLOT,** contrived and carried on by **POPISH RECUSANTS,** for (horresco referens) **ASSASSINATING and MURDERING THE KING,** and for **SUBVERTING the GOVERNMENT,** and rooting out, and **DESTROYING the PROTESTANT RELIGION.**

By what is already said, (I suppose) you may see, what the Roman-Catholick, or Popish Principles and Practices have been, are, and (while there is a Pope, and a Party to believe and incourage such Practices) ever will be; and how dangerous such Principles are, and (when put in execution) how pernicious they are (and ever will be) to all **PRINCES,** especially **PROTESTANTS,** and all those they are pleas'd to call, or miscall Heretiques. Their received Principles I have hitherto mentioned are these:

1. The Pope (with them) is **Supreme MONARCH** of (all) the World; even in Temporals; at least *indirectè,* (as the most moderate amongst them sometimes say) and *in ordine ad spiritualia,* which distinction can afford no comfort or security to Temporal Princes. For if the Pope have such vast power, *directè,* or *indirectè,* 'tis all one, he has it; and if a Prince be deposed, or murdered, by either end of the distinction, he is equally, and as surely

surely Murder'd; as he who is kill'd by the edge or back of the Sword, is as certainly kill'd.

They say, the Pope has power to (d) Excommunicate, curse, and Damn King

To depose and deprieve them of all their Royal Power and Jurisdiction.

To absolve their Subjects from all Obligations (whether Natural or afterwards arising from Oaths) to fidelity and obedience.

To Arme their Subjects against their Sovereigns, so deposed by the Pope, their Supreme Judge, and (according to the profest'd Doctrine of the Jesuits, Canonists, &c.) infallible too, in rebus facti & p'dicti.

That this taking of Arms against their King, (when deposed by the Pope) is no Rebellion against their King; seeing (by their Traiterous Principles) as soon as deposed, he ceases to be their Sovereign.

That, if in such a War, they kill their King, (especially if he be an Heretique) it is no crime, no Homicide or Murder, but a Meritorious work, to which the Pope has promised Plenary Indulgence, and Pardon of all their Sins, and an higher place in Heaven.

(c) And this vast power the Pope challenges over all Kings and Emperors, to Excommunicate and Depose them, is such; that if any King or Emperor obey not the Decree of the Pope and his Councils, he is, *ipso facto*, deprived of all his dignity, and Goods, &c. It is not any private person, but a General Council of their own, which tells us so..... *Omnibus Christi fidelibus inhibet, sub p. n. PRIVATIONIS OMNIUM DIGNITATUM & HONORUM Ecclesiasticorum & mundanorum, et ALIIS PENIS* *ipsis: citant, REGALIS, & dignitatis, aut IMPERIALIS; quibus & contra HANC IN-EHIBITIONEM fecerint, sit AUTHORITYE BRUJUS DECRETI, et IPSO FACTO PRIVATI, &c.* Concil. Constantiense, Sess. 38. *In Sententia contra Benedictum.* 13. Nay, if they be but negligent in executing the Decrees of the Pope and his Council, they incur all those punishments..... *Si NEGLIGENS extiterit, cuiuscunque dignitatis fuerit; etiam si IMPERIALIS, &c.* illas penas IPSO FACTO incurrat, quæ in Constitut. Bonifacii Papæ 8. continentur, cap. Felicitis 5. Extra de Pœnis, in 6. They are the words of the same Council of Constance, Sess. 29. *In Provisione adversus Schisma futurum.*

by the Murder of as he who is kill'd by the
 8. Nays (to give them the highest encouragements
 to commit all those Villanies, Christians are capable
 of) they shall be reputed Martyrs, referr'd into
 their Calendars in Red Letters, and (in their opi-
 nion) be esteemed great Saints in Heaven, who in
 Earth were known to be Rebels to their Prince, and
 justly Executed for High Treason. For so, as is be-
 fore said and proved) those who (by the Hand of
 Justice) perish'd for their Prodigious Villany, in the
 Gunpowder Conspiracy, are reckon'd for Martyrs in
 the Jesuits Martyrology. Now, how dangerous
 such Principles (having such a) *book-encouragement*) may
 prove to all, especially Protestant Princes, do you
 and the World Judge. But as to the danger of such Doctrines, this is
 not all, (though too much) for it is not only a re-
 ceived Doctrine in the Roman Church (That the
 Pope may depose Kings and Emperors if they be
 Heretiques, (as with them, we are sure all Prote-
 stants are!) but further, of
 I. That Subjects also (as well as the Pope) may
 lawfully depose their Sovereigns, if they be
 Heretiques.

II. Nay, that they ought, and (both in Law and
 Conscience) are strictly bound to depose their
 Princes if they be Heretiques.

III. And their approved, and great Writers pub-
 licly confess, (in their Books printed and li-
 censed by the Authority of their Church) that
 both the former Propositions are approved by

(4) No less than 15000
 Guineys promised by the Je-
 suits, to one who should As-
 sassinate our Gracious King,
 and 4000 to Murder Justice
 Godfrey, as appears by the Pa-
 pers of the discovery of the
 late horrid Conspiracy, and
 Mr. Bedlow's Confession.

2. This is the Proposition, which the Fathers at the (a) General Council at Constance, condemned, (for a General approved Council, and confirm'd by a true Pope, they acknowledge it; though they have little reason for it, as may appear by what (b) Gesner has said, and (c) Longus à Coriolano has not (though he endeavour it) Answer'd.) But it is penn'd with that Art, and Roman-Catholic cunning, that though it seem to say something for the Security of Kings and Princes; yet indeed it is (as to that purpose) altogether insignificant. For,

(a) They confess it to be *Concilium Generale approbatum, & à Gregorio Duodecimo Vero Pontifice, confirmatum.* Longus à Coriolano, in *summa Concilii*, p. 818. yet they reject what displeaseth the Pope in it. *Idem Ibidem.*

(b) Gesner. in *Præfat. ad Epitomen Concilii*. ex *additis ad Chronicon Urspersens.*

(c) Longus à Coriolano, p. 865.

1. Here is nothing in this Proposition, or the Condemnation of it, by the Council; which condemns, or any way disapproves the Popes Excommunications or Depositions of Kings, their Absolutions of their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, or giving away their Dominions. It is only the *Assassinations and Murdering of Tyrants* which are spoken of; not any Excommunications, Depositions, &c. of Kings.

2. Nor does the Council deny, but that every **TYRANT** may be kill'd; but that which they condemn as erroneous, is; That every Tyrant may, and all **OWBHT** to be kill'd. Now this is a Conjunctive and Copulative Proposition; and such Propositions are (in Logique) false, when either part is false, though both be not. So this Proposition, *Every Man is rational and Learn'd*; is erroneous, because one part is so:

for

for though every Man be Rational; yet every Man is not Learned. In like manner, although it will be granted at Rome, that every Tyrant may be Kill'd; yet that every Tyrant ought to be Kill'd, will not be so easily granted. For let him be a Tyrant in respect of Title, one who is an Usurper, and has no right to the Crown; yet let him be a Roman Catholique, a zealous Maintainer and Promoter of the Papal Religion and Interest; or one under whom they find more favour than they did expect from the true King; they will not say that he OUGHT to be Kill'd. And on this account it was (I believe) that the Pope and his Party did not think, That CROMWELL (though a Tyrant) OUGHT to be Kill'd; or (for ought I know,) ever went about it; (though they desired and endeavoured to take away the Life of CHARLES the Martyr, who had a most just Title to the Crown) because they found more favour under him, and more freedom from the punishment of Penal Laws, than they ever had before; or could expect, if the true Owner of it, possess'd the Crown. In Cromwell's time, no Oaths of Allegiance or Supremacy were press'd upon them, our Liturgy and Common-Prayers were taken away, and an Ordinance pass'd, That no Man should be Censured for not coming to Church; so that there was no way then to discover, or legally convict a Popish Reculant. On which ground, the Fathers at Constance, might condemn this

Propo-

Proposition, (as erroneous) *Quilibet Tyrannus*
non debet Every Tyrant *MAY*, and *OUGHT* to be
Kill'd; and not deny that every Tyrant *MIGHT*
be Kill'd.

3. When they condemn this Proposition, (as er-
 roneous) Every Tyrant may *LAWFULLY*,
 and *MERITORIOUSLY* be *Kill'd*: on the
 same account the Proposition is erroneous, and (as
 such) might be condemned by them; and yet
 they might believe it *LAWFUL* to Kill any
 Tyrant, thought not *Meritorious*.

4. When they say, a Tyrant cannot lawfully be
Kill'd per Quemcumque Vassallum & Subditum,
 by any of his Subjects; this is but poor com-
 fort for Kings or Princes; and afford them no
 certain Security. For if a King be *Kill'd*, it is
 not much material, whether a Native or an A-
 lien be the Assassin; he is *Kill'd*. So that not-
 withstanding all the Council of *Constance* has
 said; they may hire an Alien to Kill a Prote-
 stant Prince, as *Lopez* was to Murder Queen
Elizabeth; and a Spaniard to Assassinate *Man-*
rich of Nassau: or (what was really intended
 and endeavour'd, and probably had taken ef-
 fect, had not the good Providence of Heaven
 miraculously hindred it) the Pope may give
 away our Nation, and send a Spanish Armado,
 as he did in Queen *Elizabeths* time) or a
 French Army, to kill Prince and People, and
 take possession of it. *Dirum omen misericors*
(qui solus potest) averruncet Deus.

5. When

5. When that Council denies this Proposition, (and condemns the Affirmative as erroneous) That a Tyrant may be Murdered by any Vassal and Subject; it is in the singular number, (per Vassallum & Subditum) and hinders not, but that more, or the major part of the Subjects and Commonweal may do it; for although this Doctrine be impious and Heretical, yet (at Rome) it is Catholique, (or Roman-Catholique) and by many of their eminent Writers, maintain'd and justify'd.

6. But Lastly; This Sentence of their General Council of *Constance*, is so far from proving that, for which it is produced; (That the Church of Rome does not approve the Depositions, or Assassinations of Kings) that it evidently proves the direct contrary. That this may appear (and without any going back, or trouble) to you; I shall put in the (a) Margent, the words of the Council of *Constance*, (though you have them before.) Now in the words cited, it is evident; 1. That when they condemn the Killing of Tyrants, **NON EXPECTATA SENTENTIA AUT MANDATO JUDICIS**, Not expecting the Sentence or command of the Judge; there is some Judge whose sentence and command should be expected. For it were ridiculous to talk of expecting the sentence or command of a Judge, if there were no such Judge, whose sentence could

(a) Quilibet Tyrannus potest, ac debet licite ac meritorie occidi, per quemcunque Vassallum & Subditum, etiam per insidias, blanditias vel adulationes, non obstante quocunque juramento aut confederatione factu cum eo. **NON EXPECTATA SENTENTIA VEL MANDATO JUDICIS** Cujuscunque. Concil. Constant. ubi supra. Sess. 15.

could be expected. 2. Now although to us, (and in truth) Kings and Supreme Princes, neither have, nor can have any Judge: it being necessary, that the Judge be Superior in Power and Jurisdiction, to the Person Judged, (otherwise he cannot be a legal and competent Judge) and to say, That Kings and Supreme Princes have any Superior on Earth, (where they are Supreme) is a contradiction.

3. But at Rome, it is otherwise; the Roman-Catholiques do constantly affirm, That both the Pope and the People, are Superiors to Kings, and may pass sentence on them, and declare them Tyrants.

4. And therefore if Subjects may not kill Kings, (who are Tyrants) without such sentence or command, but must expect it; then if thy have expected, and have it, then they may kill them lawfully and meritoriously.

For *exceptio firmat regulam in non exceptis*.

5. And 'tis to be observed, that it is, *Sententia vel Mandato Judicis*, by the Sentence or Command of the Judge. So that if any private Person have the command of the Pope or People, (who are (b) the Popish Judges in this case) or the Sentence of either of them, declaring any King to be a Tyrant; then this is Warrant enough (by their impious Popish Politiques) for any private Person to kill such a King.

From which Roman-Catholique Doctrine, it evidently follows, that when (in our late Civil Wars, and unhappy Rebellion) the Parliament had declared CHARLES the Martyr a

N

Tyrant,

(b) Regem (si Tyrannus declaratur à PAPA vel POPULO) quilibet, etiam PRIVATUS, potest FURE PERFERRE. Mariana de Rege & Regis Institut. Mogunt. 1605. p. 59, 60.

(c) Tyrannus est, qui SACRA PATRIA pefundat. Ibid. p. 60. That is, qui sacra Papistica, & Religionem Romano-Catholicam, (quantum in se est) supprimit, & extirpat.

(d) In all their Excommunications of Heretiques, the Rile is usually this—*Anathematizamus omnes Hereticos, eorum FAUTORES, & generaliter quoslibet illorum DEFENSORES, &c.* Bulla Coenz. Sect. 1. In Bullario Romano, Lugd. 1673: Tom. 5. P. 528.

Tyrant; any particular Person (without Erecting an High Court of Justice, as they mis-call'd it) might lawfully have Murdered him. 6. It is to be further observed, that (by their Popish Principles) *Tyranny and Heresie in Kings, are crimes equally deserving Deposition and Death*; and every (c) Heretical King is a Tyrant with them. Whence it follows, 1. That if the Pope command any one to kill a Protestant (or which with them is all one, an Heretical) Prince; then (according to this Decree and Doctrine of the Council of Constance) he may lawfully do it. 2. Or if he give no such command, but pass a definitive Sentence against any such Prince, and in a Damnatory Bull declare him an Excommunicate and Deposed Heretique; (or (d) Favourer of them) then any private Person has sufficient Warrant and Authority to Murder him. So that when Pope Pius the Fifth had Excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, (by this their Popish Divinity) any one of her Subjects might (without any further Authority, or fault) have Murdered her. Now whether such Principles as these, be not dangerous, inconsistent with Loyalty, and (to Protestant Princes) pernicious, let the World judge. Sure I am, our Kings (and Parliaments) knowing (by sad experience) the fatal and pernicious Consequences of such Popish Principles, have publickly declared this their sense and detestation of them. I shall give an Instance or two.

1. Our

1. Our Gracious King, (in a Proclamation) having ſpoken of the *Inteſtine Diviſions* amongſt us, it follows: (e) Which are **CHIEFLY OCCASIONED** by the *Undermining Contrivances* of **POPIſH RECUSANTS**, *whoſe Numbers and INSOLENCIES* are of late **GREATLY increased**, and *whoſe RESTLESS PRACTICES* threaten **SUBVERSION** to the **CHURCH** and **STATE**. The reſtleſs Practices are the miſchievous Conſequents of their impious Principles.

(e) Proclamation dated at Whitehall, 16 Jan. 1673. and you have it in the Gazette, Num. 853.

2. A full (f) Parliament, (and a Popiſh one too) takes notice of, and condemns the **Papal Uſurpations**, in taking upon them to diſpoſe of inheritances and Kingdoms, in theſe words: The Pope, **CONTRARY** to the *inviolable Grants of Jurifdictions* **BY GOD IMMEDIATELY** to Emperors and Kings, hath **PRESUMED** to inveſt who ſhould pleaſe him, to inherit in other Mens Kingdoms and Dominions: which we your Loyal Subjects **SPIRITUAL** and **TEMPORAL**, **ABHORRE** and **DETEST**. Such were the Popes Uſurpations then; but (as in Parliament they confeſs) abhorred and deteſted by Clergy and Laity. But now (as evidently appears by the lately diſcovered damnable Conſpiracy) the Pope and his Party, take upon them to Murder our Gracious King, (whom God preſerve) and diſpoſe of His Kingdoms. Which Practices,

(f) Statut. Anno 25 Hen. 8. cap. 22. which was Ann. Chriſt. 1533. and he was not Excommunicated till the year 1538. Magnum Bullarium Roman. Lugd. 1655. Tom. 1. p. 704.

and Principles which cause and encourage them, I do (and justly may) call Dangerous, and (when they take effect, which I hope they never will) Destructive and Pernicious.

And here further, because many of our Popish Party, seeing the horridness of this Damnable and Hellish Conspiracy, and (in reality I hope, or at least) seem to condemn both it, and the Authors of it; laying the blame upon the Persons only of some few, and with great confidence, (to give it no worse name) denying the Roman Church to approve, or receive any Principles, which can encourage such Conspiracies, or prove pernicious, or dangerous to Princes, their Persons, or Government: I shall briefly give you an account of some more of their received Doctrines and Principles, (besides those already named) which have been, and (while they are believed) ever will be prejudicial to Princes, and the Peace and Quiet of their Subjects and Dominions. For instance,

1. The Church of Rome expressly declares it unlawful for Secular Princes to require any Oath of Fidelity or Allegiance of their Clergy; and as expressly forbids all their Clergy to take any such Oath, if it be required. (g.) *Nimis de Jure DIVINO quidam LAICI Usurpare conantur, cum Viros Ecclesiasticos nihil temporale continentes, ad præstandum sibi FIDELITATIS JURAMENTUM compellunt Sacri Authoritate Concilii PROHIBEMUS, ne tales CLERICI*

(g) Concil. Lateran. Magnum sub Innocentio 3. Can. 43. Vid. Baronium Annal. Tom. 10. ad Annum 858. Sect. 49. pag. 155.

THEY persons **SECLARIBUS** *præstare cogantur* **non** *hujusmodi Juramentum*, &c. This is the Constitution of their great and (Oecumenical) Council under Innocent the Third, and is referred into the Body of their Canon (h) Law, by Pope Gregory the IX, and remains in the (i) best Editions of it, commended and (k) confirmed by Pope Gregory the XIII. So that by the Popish Canons, and their approved and received Laws, no Secular Prince may require any Oath of Allegiance and Fidelity, of any of the Clergy, or Ecclesiastiques, nor are the Clergy to take any such Oaths. And if a Clergy-man should take any such Oath, it is (by their Canon-Law) for several reasons, declared null, and not obligatory. For, 1. They tell us, That no Oath which is against the (a) Ecclesiastical Utility, and Benefit of the Church, is valid and binding. Nay, the Law it self there says, That all such Oaths against Ecclesiastical Utility, are not Oaths properly, but (b) Perjuries. And the case is put in their Law, of a Prince, who fearing some (c) CONSPIRACY against him, took an Oath of some, that they should not (for the future) be in any Conspiracy against him. They who had taken this Oath, desired to know how far they were bound by this Oath. And that Law, and Innocent the Third, gives this Answer, (d) That they were not so bound by that Oath, but that they might stand against the Prince (to whom they had so Sworn) in the lawful defence of

(h) Cap. Nimis. 30. Extra De Furejurando.

(i) Corpus Juris Canon. Paris. 1612. & 1618. & Lugduni 1661.

(k) In Bulla dat. Rom. 1. Jul. 1580. Corpori Juris Canonici præfixa.

(a) *Juramentum contra utilitatem Ecclesiasticam profectum NON TENET.* Lemma ad cap. Sicut. 27. Extra De Furejurando.

(b) *Non juramenta sed perjuris potius dicenda, quæ contra utilitatem Ecclesiasticam, &c.* dicto cap. Sicut. 27.

(c) *Princeps timens conspirationes aliquas fieri contra eum, Juramentum extorsit, quod, de cætero contra ipsum non esset.* Cap. Petitio. 31. Extra De Furejurando.

(d) *Declaramus, vos Juramento hujusmodi NON TENERE, quin pro juribus & honoribus Ecclesiæ, & vestris, legitimè defendendis, CONTRA IPSUM PRINCIPEM stare libere valeatis.*

of the Rights and Honor of the Church and their
 Now 'tis certain, that the Pope (with
 them) is the sole Supreme Judge in all Ec-
 clestical Causes; (and such this is, concern-
 ing the Rights and Honors of the Church)
 and therefore if he Judge (as we are sure he
 will) that our Oathes of Allegiance and Su-
 premacy, be against the Rights and Honor of
 that Church, of which he pretends to be the
 Head; neither those, nor any such Oathes will
 be obligatory to any of his party; at least they
 will think them not to be so; and so they will
 think, that (notwithstanding any such Oath)
 they may, for the benefit of the Church, and
 the Catholique Cause, oppose and conspire
 against their Prince. 2. It is a Rule in their
 (e) Law (and in reason too) That in all Oathes,
 it must be understood, that the right of the Su-
 perior is excepted, and must be preserved. So
 if a Tenent Swear Fealty to his Landlord, how
 great soever (so he be a subject) it must be,
salvo jure dominii principalis; the Royal Rights
 of his Prince, must not, cannot be prejudiced
 by that Oath. This is true in *Thesi*. Now
 we know, that the Pope (and his party who
 acknowledge him) thinks that he is far supe-
 rior to all Kings; and therefore if he think
 and declare (as we know he has done) that
 our Oathes of Allegiance and Supremacy are
 prejudicial to his rights, then neither he, nor his
 party will think them binding. 3. If they
 were confess'd to be obligatory; yet they of
 the

(e) *Disum juramentum ex-
 culare non potest, in quo debet in-
 telligi jus superioris exceptum. In-
 nocentius, 3. cap. Venientes.
 19. extra. De iurejurando.*

but the Popish Church; believe *non dispense* (f) with them; and null the obligation. This is the constant Tenet of the (g) Canonists; who not only tell us; *That the Pope does usually and easily dispence with Involuntary; but not with voluntary Oaths*; yet if he do dispence with voluntary Oaths; it is (h) *valid*. Nor is it any wonder, if the Pope dispence with Oaths (voluntary or involuntary); if it be true, which John Sameca the Glossator there tells us..... *That the Pope can dispence against the LAW OF (i) NATURE, and against the APOSTLE*. And that we might take notice of it, those words (in the (k) old Editions of the Canon-Law) are put in the Margent: *Papa contra Apostolum dispensat*: the Pope dispenses against the Apostle. And in the latter (l) Editions of that Law with the Gloss (even those confirm'd by Pope Gregory the Thirteenth, as most Correct, and purged from Errors) they are so far from disowning that irrational and impious Gloss; that (in a Note there in the Margent,) they explain and justify it. *It is not absurd* (sayes the (m) Author of that Note) *for the Pope to dispence against the Apostle, as to positive Law*. So that Papists may take as many Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy as their Prince shall please, yet the Pope (when he pleases) can dispence with them; and set them free, from all obligation of fidelity. And hence it evidently follows; That a true Roman-Catholic (who believes this Popish Power of dispensing

(f) *Papa secundum plenitudinem potestatis, de jure potest supra jus dispensare. Cap. Propositum. 4. Extra. De Consecratione. Præbenda.* Vid. Spotswoods Hist. of Scotland, p. 308.

(g) Vid. Gratian. Can. 2, 3, 4, 5. Caus. 15. Quest. 6. the Gloss. and Card. Turrecremata there.

(h) *Si tamen absolvat aliquem, tenet absolutio.* Glossa ad dictum. Can. 2. verbo. Absolvimus.

(i) *Dico* (says the Gloss) *Quod contra FUS. NATURALE potest dispensare & contra APOSTOLUM.* Gloss. Ibid.

(k) Edit. Paris. 1522.

(l) Edit. Paris. 1612.

(m) *Non est absurdum Papam dispensare contra Apostolum quoad jus positivum.* Nota ad Glossam ad dictum Can. 2. verbo Absolvimus.

(a) As may (to omit all others) abundantly appear by Father Parsons Book writ against the Oath of Allegiance: The Title of his Book is this, *A Discussion of the Answer of Dr. Will. Barlow.* And at large lately in Father Caron's *Remonstrantia Hibernorum*, &c.

pending with all Oaths) may take a thousand Oaths of Allegiance, and yet give no assurance of his Fidelity to his Prince; seeing the Pope may (upon their approv'd Principles) when he pleases, set them free from all such Obligations. But, if all these ways, of nulling the Obligations of Oaths of Allegiance fail: yet the Popes Janizaries (the Jesuites) have a new way to prevent all such Obligations of Oaths, without any Dispensations; and that is by Equivocations, rectifying Intentions, and their Doctrine of Probabilities: pernicious Errors, destructive of Humane Society; and so notoriously now known to the World, that I neither shall, nor need go about to prove them, or shew the pernicious consequences of them. Sure I am, that by their Popish Principles, no Papists in England are (a) permitted to take the Oath of Allegiance to their King: and then tis easie to judge, what good Subjects they are like to be. For certainly, what I may lawfully do, that (on a just and serious occasion) I may swear to do. If it be a duty, and lawful for me to obey my Princes commands, and pay him fidelity; then certainly, I may (by Oath) bind myself to the performance of it. So all Men, by the Law of Nature and Moral Veracity, are bound to *speake truth*; it is both *lawful and a duty*: and therefore, when (in Judicature) I am call'd to be a Witness; I may, and (by the consent of all Nations) ought to take an Oath, to
bind

bind me, and assure others, that I will speak truth. All Men (as I said, and all confels) are bound by an indispensable Law of Nature to speak truth (when there is a just occasion for it) and yet (in Judicature) his testimony would not pass for good evidence, who (being required) would not (by Oath) confirm the truth of it. And therefore Princes have just reason to believe, that those who will not take an Oath to be Loyal Subjects, will never be so without it. And indeed the reason why Princes may justly suspect the fidelity of their Popish Clergy, who refuse the Oath of Allegiance, will farther appear, if we consider,

2. That when and where Popery prevails, all their Bishops swear absolute Allegiance and Fidelity to the Pope, and therefore cannot swear it to their Prince too. The Oath every Popish Bishop must take at his Consecration, is this

...*(b)* I.N. from this time forward, will be **FAITHFUL and OBEDIENT** to my Lord the Pope and his Successors....**THE COUNSELS** with which they trust me, I will not discover **TO ANY MAN**, to the hurt of the Pope or his Successors...I will assist them to retain and defend the Popedom, and **THE**

(c) **ROYALTIES** of St. Peter, against **ALL MEN**I will carefully conserve, defend, and promote the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the Pope. I will not be in any Counsel, Fact, or Treaty, in which any thing prejudicial to the persons, rights, or power of the Pope is contrived: and if I shall know any such things treated of, by **ANY**

O

WHOM-

(b) Ego N. ab hac hora in antea, fidelis & obediens ero Domino N. Papæ & suis successoribus, Consilium quod mihi credituri sunt, ad eorum damnum NEMINI pandam. Papatum & REGALIA St. Petri adjutor eis ero ad retinendum & defendendum CONTRA OMNEM HOMINEM Furæ, honores privilegia, & AUTHORITY PAPÆ — Conserve, defendere & promovere curabo. Non ero in consilio, facto vel tractatu, in quibus contra Papam — aliqua sinistra vel prejudicialia personarum, juris & potestatis ejus machinentur, & si talia a QUIBUSCUNQUE tractari novero, impediam pro POSSE, & quanto citius poterò SIGNIFICABO Domino PAPÆ — Mandata Apostolica TOTIS VIRIBUS observabo, & FACIAM AB ALIIS OBSERVARI. HÆRETICOS ET REBELLES DOMINO PAPÆ PERSEQUAR, & IMPUGNABO Vocatus ad Synodum veniam, Verba sunt dicti Juramenti. Vide Pontificale Romanum. De Consecratione Electi in Episcopum, p. 57. Editum Romæ 1611.

(c) Here it is REGALIA Sancti Petri. But this is an Addition to the Oath (which was bad enough before) for antiently it was REGULAS SANCTORUM Patrum. As their own Canon-Law assures us. Cap. Ego. N. 4. Extra de Jurjurando,

WHOMSOEVER, I will (to the utmost of my power) hinder them, and with all possible speed signify them to the Pope.... I will (to the UTMOST OF MY POWER) observe the POPES COMMANDS, and MAKE OTHERS observe them. I will impugn and PERSECUTE HERETICKS, and REBELS to my LORD THE POPE. I will come to the Synod, WHEN HE CALLS ME, &c. This, and much more such stuff, you have in that Oath. Now this is evidently an Oath of Allegiance and Fidelity to the Pope. Wherein (to omit other things) they swear, 1. Never to discover the Popes Counsels (how treasonable soever) TO ANY MAN, (not the King.) 2. To defend the Popes ROYALTIES, against ALL MEN, (the King not excepted.) 3. And if any thing be treated of prejudicial to the Pope, BY ANY WHOMSOEVER, (the King not excepted) they swear, (TO THE UTMOST OF THEIR POWER) to oppose and hinder it. Here is (you see) an Oath of absolute Allegiance to the Pope, which cannot consist with that Homage and Allegiance, or Fidelity, which not only at present, but anciently, even in times of Popery, all the Bishops of England did, and solemnly swore to their King, as a (d) great Lawyer tells me. And not long before him, it is certain, that Bishops at their Consecration, took no Oath at all to the Pope, but only promised him Canonical Obedience. For in the old Ordo (a) Romanus, which (as all agree) was writ by (b) Arnoldus Constantiensis Presbyter, about the

(d) Vide Hen. Bracton, De Legibus Angliæ, lib. 2. cap. 35. Sect. 4. Bracton flourished about the 30. year of Hen. 3. An. Dom. 1246.

(a) Vid. Ordinem Romanum veterem, apud Georg. Ferrarium, De Catholica Ecclesia, Divinis officiis. Romæ 1591, p. 70 71.

(b) So Tritheimius de Scripturis, &c. Possesines Apparatus, both of them, In Arnoldo Constantiensis, and Vossius de Symbolis Coenæ Dom. Th. 1. p. 441.

the year 1060. The Metropolitan (who consecrates) asks the person to be consecrated, thus; *Vifne Beato Petro, fuaque Ecclefia, ejusque VICARIO & fuccefforibus, fidem & fubjectionem per omnia exhibere* & The Answer is *Volo*. Then follows the promise of fidelity and fubjection to his Metropolitan: But with this difference. To the Pope he promises..... *Fidem & obedientiam per omnia* (as to the prime Patriarch.) But to the Metropolitan he only promises (but fwears to neither of them) *Fidem & obedientiam exhibere*. But to let this pafs: It is manifest, that whenever this Oath to the Pope began to be exacted of Bifhops, it has been in ufe ever fince the time of Pope Gregory (c) the IX. who patch'd up, and (d) publish'd the Decretals; In which you have the form of the Oath the Bifhops then took to the Pope; neither fo long by far, nor fo bad, as of later years has been required of all Bifhops; yet bad enough. For when they fware obedience and fidelity abfolutely to the Pope (as now they do) (e) *CONTRA OMNES HOMINES*, (neither King nor Emperor excepted.) And we are told in fome later Editions of their Canon-Law, that now, not onely all Bifhops, but whoever receives any (f) dignity of the Pope, take an Oath, and fwear Allegiance to him: and, is it poffible, that thefe perfons who do, and muft Swear fuch abfolute obedience and fidelity to the Pope, can be faithful and loyal fubjects to their Prince? and

(c) Sedet Gregorius 9. An. Dom. 1226. In that year he was made Pope.

(d) Which was Ann. 1230. and refers that Oath to Gregory the 7th. who was made. Pope, An. 1073.

(e) Vid. Cap. Ego. N. 4. Extra. De Furejurando.

(f) Hodie omnes recipientes dignitatem a Papa, sibi jurant. Ita Lemma ad Cap. dictum 4. Edit. Lugduni. 1661.

indeed, are not such Popish Principles both dangerous, and especially to Protestant Princes pernicious, and inconsistent with the Loyalty of Subjects, or safety of Supreme Powers? nor is this all; there is more danger yet to Kings and Princes from their Popish Principles. For,

3. They *Exempt* all Ecclesiastiques from paying any Tax or Contribution to secular Princes, without the Popes Leave. This is the constant Doctrine of their (g) *Casuits*, their (h) *Canon-Law*, and (i) *Canonists*. Who tell us (k)..... *Quod Laici Collectas imponentes Clericis, sunt excommunicati, cum suis fautoribus*; All Laymen (by their Law) are Excommunicated, if they lay any Tax upon the Clergy. And again (more fully) we are told. 1. That (l) the Clergy **OUGHT NOT** to relieve the **NECESSITIES** of Cities, or any other places; no, not even then when the Laicks are in want, unless the Pope be first consulted. 2. That all Decrees and Constitutions of Laymen, laying such Taxes upon the Clergy, are null, and never can be made obligatory. 3. All persons Excommunicated for such grievances laid upon the Clergy, and their **SUCCESSORS**, stand Excommunicated; unless they make satisfaction within a Month. 4. And they tell us, that all this is said for a fuller declaration of the Law in this Case, that Novices may better understand it. This is their

(g) Vid. Filliacium Quæst. Moralium. Tractatu. 16. cap. 11. p. 325.

(h) Vid. cap. non minus. 4. & cap. Adversus. 7. extra. De Immunitate Ecclesiarum.

(i) Panormitan. ad dicta, cap. 4. & 7.

(k) Lemma ad dictum, c.

(l) Clerici non debent necessitatibus Civitatum aut aliorum locorum, etiam ubi laicorum non preperunt facultates, subvenire (this is highly uncharitable), nisi prius Rom. Pontifex consulatur. 2. Sententia & Constitutiones editæ à Laicis collectantibus Ecclesiam, sunt ipso jure **IRRITÆ**, nec ulla tempore convalescant. 3. Reges Excommunicati ob gravamina premissa, remanent Excommunicati, etiam post depositum officium, & successores, nisi satisfecerint intra mensem. Hæc dicit ad maiorem declarationem & pro Novitiis. Lemma ad cap. adversus 7. Extra. De Immunitate Ecclesiarum.

their own Exposition of the Canon, in the most (m) correct Body of their Canon-Law; and they there tell us, that it is the Canon of a (n) General Council, and then (according to their Principles) infallibly true, and obligatory to all the Christian World. So that by this Popish Law, if any Lay-men (the King and Parliament of England) lay any Tax, or (by a Statute) require any Subsidy of Clergymen, (though in the Necessities of the Kingdom) without the Popes leave; such Statute is declared Void and Null, and they and their Successors (unless satisfaction be made) Excommunicate. Nor is it only some Inferior Magistrates or Officers, who are thus Excommunicated; but all Persons, (a) *CUJUSCUNQUE conditionis, Status aut DIGNITATIS*. And that we may know, that such Excommunications are not a rash and inconsiderate Act of Urban the Fifth, or some angry Pope, they have been, (for some Ages past) and still are solemnly publish'd at Rome, every Year, in that famous and impious *Bulla Cœna Domini*, on Maundy-Thursd. (Even on that day, in which our Blessed Saviour Instituted that *Cœna Domini*, as a Sacrament of our Union with him, by a lively Faith, and of the Communion of all Christians amongst themselves, by an unfeigned love and charity. I say, on this day, the greatest part of the Christian World, are Anathematiz'd and Curs'd at Rome, by their Popes successively, for no other reason but because

(m) Vid. Corpus Juris Canonici Lugduni. Anno 1661.

(n) Disto Cap. Adversus 7. in Lemmate. Idem Innocentius. 3. in Concil. Generali. And the Note tells us, in Concil. Lateran. cap. 46.

(a) Ita Urbanus Papa 5. Constitut. 1. Edita Anno 1364. In Bullario Rom. Tom. 1. pag. 282. num. 1. 2. Edit. Lugduni. 1655.

(b) *Qui Collectas, Tallias, prestationes, & alia onera personis Ecclesiasticis, & eorum, Ecclesiarum, & Beneficiorum Ecclesiasticorum bonis, illorumque redditibus — absque Romani Pontificis expressa licentia imponunt; aut sic imposita, ETIAM A SPONTE DANTIBUS, recipiunt. Necnon qui per se, vel alios directe vel indirecte praelata facere, exequi vel procurare non verentur, CUSCUSCONQUE sint praeeminentie, dignitatis, &c. etiamsi IMPERIALI, REGALI, &c. praefulgeant dignitate, &c.* They are all Excommunicated every year in that *Bulla Canonica*. Vid. *Bullam Alexandri Papae 7. seu Constitut. ejus 16.* In *Bullario Rom. Tom. 5. data erat Bulla dicta, Idib. April 1656.* & *Bullam Clementis Papae 10. dat. Rom. 7. Cal. April. Anno 1671. Ejusdem Bullarii Tom. 5. Constitut. Clement. 10. 34. and in both those Bulls, Sect. 18.*

(c) *Concil. Lateran. sub Innocentio Papa 3. Ann. 1215, Can. 46.*

(d) *Concil. Lateran. magnum sub Innocentio 3. Anno 1215. Can. 46.*

(e) *Sess. 25. cap. 20. De Immunitate Ecclesiarum.*

(f) *Decernit ac PRÆCIPIT sacros Canones, & Concilia Generalia OMNIA, & APOSTOLICAS sanctiones — EXACTE ab OMNIBUS observari DEBERE. Ibid.*

(g) *Tanquam DEI PRÆCEPTA. Ibidem.*

because they are for the Truth of the Gospel, and against his (without any reason or sense) Usurp'd Greatness and Worldly Interest.) In that Bull, the Anathema, or Papal Curse (*Stilo Curiae*) is thus: (b) *We Excommunicate all, of what Dignity soever, REGAL, IMPERIAL, DUCAL, &c. who impose any Tax, Toll, or Prestation upon any Ecclesiastiques, or receive any Taxes so impos'd, (though the Persons on whom they are imposed, would WILLINGLY pay them) without the special and EXPRESS LICENCE of the Pope.* Now although this (afore said) were evidence enough to intitle the Church of Rome to such desperate Doctrine and Excommunications; yet we have further and greater evidence; I mean, their Great Lateran (c) Council, consisting of above 1200 Fathers, (such as they were) Synodically (d) ratifying the same Doctrine: and all this expressly confirmed by the (e) Trent Council; which tells us, That this Immunity and Exemption of the Clergy, is, *DEI ORDINATIONE & Canonicks Sanctionibus Constituta*; and therefore Decrees and (f) *COMMANDS*, That all the Sacred Canons, all General Councils, and all Papal Constitutions, in favor of Ecclesiastical Persons and the Liberties of the Church, be (and ought to be) exactly observed; and that, as (g) *THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD*: and admonisheth the *EMPEROR, KINGS and PRINCES, &c.* and obliges

obliges them to such Observation. Nor is the Trent Council content with this; but (b) requires her Ecclesiastiques (and many more, of which anon) to (i) PROMISE, SWEAR and VOW, firmly (and without all doubting) to believe all the Canons and Councils before-mentioned, (especially the Decrees of the Trent Fathers.) By the Premises, I think it evident; that (by the (k) approved Doctrine and Principles of the Roman Church) no Kings, Princes or Parliaments, nor any LAYMEN, (how many or great soever) can lay any Tax upon Ecclesiastiques, (no not in the greatest Necessity and Poverty of the Lay-Subjects) without expresse leave first had from the Pope. Now whether this Popish Doctrine, (if approved and believed) be not very dangerous and pernicious, (especially to Protestant Princes) do you judge. Nor is this all; for,

(b) Concil. Trident. in forma Professionis Fidei, in calce Sess. 25.

(i) Promitto, Voveo, Furo. Ibid.

(k) How dear this Doctrine of the Exemption of Ecclesiastical Persons from the Power of Laymen to Tax them, &c. is at Rome, appears by the Index Expurgatorius of Pope Alexander the Seventh, Edit. Romæ 1667. pag. 8. where the Command is—*Expurganda sunt OMNES Propositiones contra libertatem, Immunitatem, & Jurisdictionem Ecclesiasticam.*

4. Their approved and received Popish Principles, do not only free them, from taking Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and their Estates (I speak of their Clergy) from Taxes, (unless the Pope consent) but their Persons also, (be their Crimes never so great) from all Punishment by Kings, or any Lay-Court or Magistrate of what State or Dignity soever. This is a manifest and known Truth, and needed no proof, were it not, that some, who have an ungrounded

ungrounded courage to believe such Seditious Principles, have also (when it makes for their Interest) a confidence to deny them. But, seeing some of the Popish Party do deny it, I shall endeavour to bring such Authentique and evident Proofs, as will (I hope) satisfy you, and might convince the Gainsayers (if they can and will impartially judge) of the Truth of the aforesaid Popish Position. The Proofs I mean, shall be drawn from the clear Testimonies of their own eminent and learned Writers, their Canon-Laws, approved and received in and by their Church, their Popes Decretals, and their own General Councils. And here,

(a) *Excommunicantur QUI-
CUNQUE Magistratus, qui
contra PERSONAS ECCLE-
SIATICAS se interponunt in
QUACUNQUE causa cri-
minali, sive HOMICIDII sive
LÆSÆ MAJESTATIS.*
Filliucius Moral. Quæst. Tra-
statu, 16. cap. 11. Sect. 307.
309.

(b) *Can. Si quis suadente,*
22. Cauf. 17. Quæst. 4.

(c) *Concil. Lateran. 2 sub
Innocentio. 2 Can. 15.*

1. An eminent Popish (a) Casuist tells us, That **ALL MAGISTRATES** whoever they be, (Kings and Princes not excepted) who interpose in Judicature, against Ecclesiastical Persons, in **ANY CRIMINAL CAUSE**, whether it be **MURDER**, or **HIGH TREASON**, are to be Excommunicated. And this he proves out of their Canon (b) Law, and the Constitution of Pope Innocent the Second, in a (c) General Council, own'd and approved by them.
2. We have a Canon of a Council at Paris, referr'd into the Body of their Law, publish'd by the Authority of Pope Gregory the Ninth, which

which determines the case thus (d) No SE-
 CULAR JUDGE may restrain or condemn ANY
 CLERGY-MAN, without the PERMISSION of
 the POPE: and if he do, he is to be excommuni-
 cate; and to continue so, till he acknowledge and
 mend his fault. You see this Seditious Popish
 doctrine is established by the Council of Paris,
 and the General Council in the Lateran: and by
 3 Popes (Innocent the Second, Gregory the Ninth,
 and (e) Gregory the Thirteenth) and so must
 be the Doctrine of the Roman Church. For it
 is Law with them; (f) That NO MAN must
 be permitted to RETRACT, or QUESTION
 any Papal Sentence. And their Law says
 further; (g) That ALL the Popes Decrees
 are IRREFRAGABLY to be observed; and
 that so far, and undoubtedly, as if St. Peter
 had confirm'd them with his own mouth: and
 Gratian cites Pope Agatho for it. But
 3. Nay further, all Secular Magistrates; are (at
 Rome) every year, solemnly Anathematiz'd and
 curs'd; (h) who call any Ecclesiastical persons to
 their Tribunals, Courts, Chanceries, Councils,
 Parliaments, &c. or any may molest them directly
 or indirectly; for it is but six or seven years
 since Pope Clement the Tenth did solemnly curse
 all secular Magistrates and all Courts (even Par-
 liaments) who should any way trouble the Cler-
 gy, or punish, or take any cognizance of their
 crimes. So that by this Popish Doctrine, our
 gracious King, his great Council (the Parlia-
 ment) and all our Courts in Westminster, stand
 P now

(d) Cap. Nullus Judicium 2.
 Extra. De foro competent: Ju-
 dex SECULARIS, si Clericum
 per se distrinxit, vel condemnat,
 excommunicari debet. That's
 the Lemma to the Chapter id
 which 'tis more fully express'd.

(e) In his Bull approving and
 confirming the Canon-Law,
 Dat. Romæ 1 Julii, 1580.

(f) NEMINI permiffum est
 de eo quod PAPA STATUIT
 JUDICARE, vel sententiam
 ejus retractare. So Pope Nico-
 las tells us in Gratian. Can.
 Nemini 3. Caus. 17. Quest. 4.

(g) Omnes sanctiones Aposto-
 lica sedis irrefragabiles sunt ob-
 servandæ. That's the Lemma or
 Title, and the Canon follows---
 Sic omnes Apostolicæ sedis san-
 ctiones accipiendæ sunt, tanquam
 ipsius DIVINI PETRI VOCE
 FIRMATÆ. Can. Sic omnes.
 2. Dist. 19.

(h) Qui personas Ecclesiasti-
 cas ad suum Tribunal, Audienti-
 am, Cancariam, PARLIA-
 MENTUM, Consilium, &c.
 trahant, aut trahi faciant directe
 vel indirecte carcerando, vel mo-
 lestando, &c. Vide Bullam Cle-
 mentis Papæ 10. Dat. Romæ 3
 April 1671. In Bullario Roma-
 no. Lugd. 1673. Tom. 5. pag.
 530. Sect. 14, 15, 16.

(i) *Causæ criminalis gravi-
oris contra Episcopos, ab ipso
TANTUM Rom. Pontifice co-
gnoscantur, ac terminentur; & mi-
nores, in Concilio TANTUM
Provinciali cognoscantur & ter-
minentur.* Concil. Trident. Sess.
24. De Reformat. cap. 5. &
Sess. 13. De Reformat. cap. 8.

(a) And all their Ecclesi-
astiques do promise, vow and
also swear, that they will firm-
ly believe and profess all that
the Canons and Councils have
declared concerning these ex-
emptions—*OMNIA à Sacris
Canonibus & Decretis Conci-
liis, & præcipue à Sancta Sy-
nodo Tridentina definita, indu-
bitanter recipere ac profiteri spon-
deo, VOVEO, FURO.* In forma
juramenti professionis fidei, in
Bulla Pii Papæ 4. in calce Sess.
25. Concil. Tridentin.

now accursed, and (till they become Papists
and Slaves to the Pope, which cursed day, I
hope will never come) that curse will be con-
tinued, and every year solemnly and impiously
renewed; and I am perswaded that a greater
curse cannot befall this Nation, than that which
will procure a Popes absolution; and free us
from his Curse.

4. In a word, the Trent (i) Council publicly
maintains this erroneous and impious doctrine,
of the exemption of their Clergy and Eccle-
siastiques, from the Jurisdiction of all Secu-
lar powers; The greater Crimes of the Bishops,
(say the Trent-Fathers, in the place (a) now
cited) can be examin'd and punish'd **ONELY
BY THE POPE**; and their lesser crimes, **ONE-
LY BY THE COUNCIL of Bishops**. No lay-
Judge or Judicature how great soever, (nor
Kings, nor Parliaments) must meddle with
them; they may securely sin, and need not
fear any punishment by any Secular power.
How dangerous and pernicious this must needs
be to all Secular supreme powers, let the world
judge. Certainly (upon these Popish principles)
all the Clergy must and will much rather fear
and obey the Pope who can, than their Prin-
ces, who (by their principles) have no power
to punish them. But this is not all; for (to
omit all other) there is one pernicious Popish
principle more, not yet mention'd, which ab-
solutely abrogates and deprives Princes and
Kings

Kings of all their Regal power, as to the Clergy. For,

Lastly, It is a constantly approved and received Doctrine at Rome, (though evidently impious and traiterous) That the Clergy and Ecclesiastiques, are **NONE OF THE KINGS SUBJECTS**. If this be *not true*, (as sure enough it is not) then their *Popish Canons* are *erroneous*, (as you shall see anon) and their *General Councils* and *Popes*, so far from being *infallible*, that they are *actually and evidently false*: For both their *Canon-law*, their *Councils*, (even *General ones*) and their *Popes* in their *Decretal Epistles* (as by the following Testimonies will appear) have *approved, received, and by their authority* (so far as they are able) *establish'd and confirm'd* this *rebellious and Popish principle*. But (on the other side) if they approve and acknowledge *this Principle* to be true, (as constantly they do) then they approve a Doctrine which is not onely dangerous, but pernicious to Princes, which dethrones and unking them. (as to all their Clergy and Ecclesiastiques:) for if they be not Subjects to any Secular Prince, then it is evident, that no such Prince can be their King; it being impossible, that any man should be King of such persons, who are none of his Subjects. And although this *Popish principle* be erroneous and traiterous, against the light of Nature and Scripture, Reason and Revelation; yet 'tis not all. For they do not only say, that

the **CLERGY ARE NONE OF THE KINGS SUBJECTS** : But (which is more erroneous and irrational) they do expressly say, that **THE CLERGY ARE SUPERIOR TO THE KING, and HE THEIR SUBJECT**. That both these Popish Positions may appear to be approved by, and generally received in the Church of Rome ; I desire you seriously to consider these following Testimonies.

(b) *Emendatum, CORRECTUM, recognitum, & APPROBATUM.* Ita in Bulla Gregorii 13. data Romæ 1580. Juri Canonico præfixa.

(c) *Imperium non PRÆEST Sacerdotio, sed SUBEST.* Lemma ad Cap. Solicitæ 6. Extra De Major. & Obedientiâ.

(d) *Episcopus NON DEBET SUBESSE PRINCIPIBUS, sed PRÆESSE.* Ibidem.

(e) *Hoc dicit Innocentius 3. & est MULTUM ALLEGABILE.* Ibidem.

(f) *Præcellit Imperator illos DONTAXAT, quæ ab eo recipiunt temporalia—Super bonos & malos, gladii accepit potestatem Imperator; sed in eos SOLUM-MODO, qui utentes gladio, sunt ejus jurisdictioni Commissi—De sacerdotali prosapia dictum est, non DE REGIA STIRPE, Constitui te super gentes & REGNA, ut EVELLAS, DISSIPES, &c. dicto Cap. Solicitæ 6. Extra. De Majorit. & Obedientiâ.*

(g) *Corpus Juris Canonici.* Paris 1520. Antwerp. An. 1570.

(h) *Paris 1612. and 1618. and at Lions 1661.*

(i) *Panormitan. ad dictum Cap. Solicitæ 6. Edit. 1509. Lugduni.*

(k) *Laur. de Flisco Episcopus Brumatenfis.*

(l) 1. *Imperium SUBEST sacerdotio, & ei OBEDIRE TENETUR.* 2. *Clericus NULLO MODO subest LAICO, nisi ratione studii ab eo habiti.* 3. *Clerici sunt EXEMPTI à jurisdictione Laicorum, JURE DIVINO.*

1. In the Body of their Canon-Law, of their most correct (b) Editions, and (as such) publish'd by the Authority of Gregory the thirteenth; we finde these words (c) **THE EMPIRE IS NOT SUPERIOR, but SUBJECT to the PRIESTHOOD.** And it there follows immediately (d) **THE BISHOP OUGHT NOT TO BE SUBJECT, BUT SUPERIOR TO PRINCES.** And that all may take notice of this Popish Position, it is there added (e) **Pope Innocent the third says this, and it is FIT TO BE ALLEDG'D MUCH** (for the Popes Supremacy he means.) And indeed Pope Innocent says that, and much more, in that Decretal (f) **Epistle**; some of the words are in the margent. And all this, in their approved Editions of their Canon-Law (g) **old and (h) new.** **Panormitan** (their great Canonist) is more (i) **express and full** to our purpose. The sum of what he says (as the Author of the (k) **Summaries** prefix'd to that Chapter tells us) is this, (l) 1. **The Emperor is SUBJECT to, and BOUND TO OBEY THE PRIEST.**

2. *The*

2. *The Clergy is NO WAY SUBJECT to the LAITY (not to the King) but onely for some Lay-Fee, or Farm held of him.* 3. *The CLERGY BY THE LAW OF GOD, are EXEMPT from the JURISDICTION of LATMEN.* And no wonder, if the *IMPERIAL POWER* must be subject to the *PONTIFICAL*; if it be true, which their *Canon-Law* (a) (out of the Decretal of *Pope Innocent the Third*) the Author of the (b) *Gloss*, and the (c) *Additions* to it, say. For the *Pope* in that *Law*, says, *That the Popes power, is as much greater than the Emperors, as THE SUN is greater than the MOON.* 2. *The Gloss* says (for so, in his *Arithmetique*, the difference is ignorantly and wildly computed) that the *Popes Power* is 47 times greater than the *Emperors*: and the *Addition* to the *Gloss* (in their best Editions of the (d) *Canon-Law*) further tells us, (out of *Ptolemy*) that the *Sun* is greater than the *Moon* 7744 times; and so (by this their Account) the *Pontifical Power* is no less than 7744 times greater than the *Imperial*; and then there is no doubt, but in their opinion who believe all this, the *Emperor* and all *Kings* must be the *Popes* Subjects, and they no way superior to him.

(a) Cap. Solicitæ 6. Extra De Majorit. & Obedientiâ.

(b) Bernard. de Botano Canonici Bononiensis in Glossa, ad verbum, Inter solern. lb.

(c) Laurentius in his Addition to the Gloss.

(d) Vide Corpus Juris Canonici, cum Glossis. Paris. 1612.

2. *Pope Martin the Fifth* cites the Decretal of *Pope Innocent the Third*, and more fully explains the meaning of it, approves (e) and confirms it, and both their Decretals are now referr'd into the body of their *Law*. (where
Pope

(e) Cap. Ad reprimendas 3. De Foro competent. In 7. Edit. Juris Canonici. Lugd. 1661.

(f) *Laici in Clericos NUL-
LA POTESTAS, &c.* Lemma
ad dictum Caput.

(g) *Non attendentes, quod
LAICIS in CLERICOS, EC-
CLESIASTICAS personas, aut
EORUM BONA, NULLA sit
attributa POTESTAS.* Ibid. Ca-
pire dicto.

(h) *Cap. Quia 2. De foro
competenti.* in 7.

(i) *Cujuscunque præminencie,
dignitatis, status, aut conditionis
existant.* Ibidem.

(k) *Principes, Marchiones,
Duces, &c. non possunt sine culpa
SACRILEGII, Clericos bannire
aut relegare.* Ibid.

(l) *Persona CUFUSLIBET
CLERICI est SANCTA quoad
hoc, quod NON POTEST SUB-
JECI POTESTATI SECU-
LARI;* & is qui contrarium
faciat, SACRILEGUS est. Ca-
jetan. in Aquinat. 2. 2. Quæst.
99. Art. 3. Sect. ad. 5. dubi-
um. And much more to the
same purpose, we have in those
2 Titles. 1. De foro compe-
tenti; and 2. De Invasoribus
bonorum Ecclesie in 7. Decre-
taliū.

(m) 1. *Reges non habent
potestatem coactivam in Ecclē-
siasticos.* 2. *Ecclesiastici non
possunt conveniri, nisi coram supe-
riori suo Ecclesiastico.* 3. *EX-
EMPTIO CLERICORUM,
est ex OMNINO SENTENTIA,
de Jure DIVINO, ita ut à po-
testatibus secularibus ETIAM
SUPREMS, judicari aut con-
demnari nequeant.* Vid. Collegii
Bononiensis Responsum pro li-
bertate Ecclesie. Bonon. 1607.
Sect. 21. 46, &c.

Pope Martins Decretal was not before :) The
Lemma, or *Title* to the Chapter before cited,
is this (f) *Lay-men have NO POWER
OVER CLERGY-MEN, &c.* And the Decretal
it self says (g) *That LAY-MEN have
NO AUTHORITY over the Clergy, ECCLE-
SIASTICAL PERSONS, or their GOODS.*
Pope Urban the sixth has the very same (h)
words, approves, and (by his Papal Authority)
confirms them; and declares all *Lay-men* (of
(i) *what eminence soever*) who exercise any
jurisdiction over *Ecclesiastiques*, (k) *Sacrilegi-
ous*, and *Excommunicates* them, and all whoe-
ver assist, abett, or defend them.

3. *Cardinal Cajetan*, who (his great Learning,
and eminent place in Government of that
Church considered) could not be ignorant what
Positions were approved at Rome, tells us (l)
..... *That the Person of EVERY CLERGY-
MAN, was SACRED thus far, that he COULD
NOT BE SUBJECT to any SECULAR
POWER.*

4. *Nay*, a whole Learned Colledge assures us,
of the truth of the 3 Propositions. 1. *KINGS
(m) have NO COACTIVE POWER over EC-
CLESIASTICKS.* 2. *ECCLESIASTICKS
cannot be sued, or call'd to an account, before
any, save onely THEIR ECCLESIASTICAL
Superior.* 3. *The EXEMPTION of the Clergy,
is IN THE JUDGMENT OF ALL* (all
Papists

Papists they mean) of **DIVINE RIGHT**; so that they cannot be **JUDG'D, or PUNISH'D** by any **SECULAR, no NOT SUPREME POWERS**. And here I desire you to consider; (what the Colledge of *Bononia* here affirms) that the Ecclesiastiques (Secular and Regular) are, in the opinion of **ALL ROMAN-CATHOLIQVES**, by the **LAW OF GOD**, so (*) exempted from the Jurisdiction of all Secular, (even **SUPREME**) **POWERS**, that they can neither Judge, nor punish them. Whence it evidently follows, 1. That the *Popish* Clergy, where-ever they are (especially in *England*, and *Protestant Kingdoms*) are no Subjects of that King, in whose dominions they live, because they are (by the Law of God) exempt from all Secular Jurisdiction: It being a contradiction to say, that any Man is a King in respect of those, over whom he has no Jurisdiction. And, 2. It follows, that this *impious and traitorous Doctrine and Position*, is not the opinion of some one, or a few private persons, but of **ALL ROMAN-CATHOLIQVES**; and so of their *Popish* Church; and then their Church (by their own Confession) is guilty of maintaining and approving such dangerous, and to all (especially *Protestant*) **Kings, Pernicious Principles**. Q. E. D.

5. But we have greater Authority (than that of the Colledge of *Bononia*) to manifest the truth of what we say, when we accuse the *Popish*

(*) Vid. cap. Et quid 4. extra. De foro competenti. in 7. where the Title, or Lemma, is this—Constitutiones editæ contra Principes Seculares, Jurisdictionis Ecclesiasticæ libertatem impediunt, Innovantur. And in the Chapter, it is declared; 1. Quod Laicis in Clericos, & personas Ecclesiasticas, & bona Ecclesiastica, non est attributa potestas. 2. And then it follows—REGES, DUCES, MARCHIONES, &c. in virtute Sanctæ OBEDIENTIÆ MANDANTES, ut ipsi constitutiones prædictas observent—Si Dei offensam, & SEDIS APOSTOLICÆ vitare voluerint ULTIONEM. Kings cannot meddle with any Ecclesiastical Persons; if they do, they offend God, and shall be punish'd by the Pope: that is, Excommunicated. So says the Pope, and his Lateran Council, Cap. 2. De Invasor. & Occup. Bon. Ecclesiæ, in 7. Decretalium.

(a) Index Expurgatorius Hispanicus, Madriti, Anno 1667. in Johanne Chrysof. pag. 703.

(b) Index Expurg. Lulitan. Olyfip. 1624. pag. 753.

(c) Edit. Basil. 1558.

(d) *Sacerdotes etiam Principibus Jure Divino subditi.*

lish Church for approving and maintaining this impious and pernicious Doctrine; *That their Ecclesiastiques are not the Kings Subjects.*

I mean the Inquisitors of (a) Spain and (b) Portugal, &c. who finding in the Index of Chry-

sofome, (c) words expressing this proposition

(d) **PRIESTS, BY THE LAW OF GOD, ARE SUBJECT TO PRINCES;** they (know-

ing that Position to be inconsistent with the Exemptions of their Popish Clergy) damn that Proposition, and command it to be blotted out:

Deleantur illa verba (say they) though Chrysofome say the very same thing, in the place to which the Index refers. Now it is evident, that

they who damn this Proposition (as erroneous)

PRIESTS by the Law of God, are subject to Princes; must (of necessity) approve and af-

firm the contradictory; *That Priests, by the Law of God ARE NOT subject to Princes:* which

is that rebellious Position, with which the

Church of Rome is justly charged.

6. Lastly, the principal Authorities I have brought to prove this (or any of the former

Rebellious Doctrines charg'd on the Church of Rome) have been, 1. Their approved, and

(by Publick Authority of their Church) received and establis'd Laws. 2. Their Popes

Bulls, Decretals and Constitutions. 3. Or the Canons of their Provincial, National, or General

Councils: All which are approved, innovated, and confirm'd expressly, in their Trent (e) Coun-

cil,

(1) Concil. Trident. Sess. 25. De Reformat. Cap. 20. *Precipit sancta Synodus, Sacros CANONES, & Consilia Generalia OMNIA, necnon alias APOSTOLICAS SANCTIONES in favorem Ecclesiasticarum personarum, & libertatis Ecclesiasticae; & contra ejus Violatores editos, quae OMNIA praesenti Decreto INNOVAT, EXACTE ab OMNIBUS observari debere.*

cil, (as was before mentioned) and all their

(f) *Secular Clergy*, all who have any cure of *Soules*, the chief of their *Regulars*, (g) *all Graduates, Professors and Readers in their Universities*, (h) *all Physitians, &c.* are solemnly (i) *sworn to approve, receive, and (without all doubting) to profess all those Canons and Papal Constitutions, and, to Anathematize, Reject, and Curse all contrary Opinions, and to endeavour (as much as in them lies) that all committed to their care, shall constantly hold and teach the same.*

The Premises impartially consider'd, I think two things may, and will evidently follow;

- 1 That the *Principles and Positions* before mention'd, are not onely dangerous, but pernicious to all *Supreme Powers*; (especially to *Protestant Kings and Princes*) and that in one thing omitted before; that is; That *Faith is not to be kept with Heretiques*, but that any competent *Ecclesiastical Judge*, may condemn, and execute *Heretiques*, (or those who are reputed such) notwithstanding any *SAFE CONDUCT* given them, *BY THE EMPEROR, KINGS, or SECULAR PRINCES*, though confirm'd by *OATH*; and this impious, and (to *Supreme Powers*) pernicious *Doctrine*, approved, and publicly declared and profess'd; not onely by particular, and private persons, but by their own *General (k) Council of Constance*: which condemn'd (l) and executed *Jerome of Prague*,

Q

and

(f) Vide Bullam Pii 4. super formâ Juramenti Professio-
nis fidei, in calce Sess. 25. Con-
cilii Trident. datam Romæ. Id.
Nov. 1564.

(g) Vid. Bullam Pii 4. Extra
De Magistris & Doctoribus cap.
In sacrosancta. 2. In Septimo.

(h) Vid. Bullam Pii Papæ
5. Extra De Medicis, cap. su-
pra gregem. 1. Decret. 7.

(i) Vide dictam Pii 4. Bul-
lam, super formâ Juramenti
Profess. fidei, & Concil. Tri-
dent. Sess. 24. De Reformat.
cap. 12. Item OMNIA & singula
Canonibus, & Decretis Con-
cilii, ac præcipue à sacrosan-
cta Synodo Trident. definitis, IN-
DUBITANTER recipio ac
profiteor, ac CONTRARIA
OMNIA rejicio ac Anathema-
tizo, ac a me subdito, vel illis,
quorum cura ad me spectat, re-
neri, doceri, & prædicari (quan-
tum in me est) curabo. Verba
sunt dictæ Bullæ Pii Papæ 4.

(k) Quod non obstantibus sal-
vis Conditionibus IMPERATO-
RIS, REGUM, & SEculi
PRINCIPUM, QUOCUN-
QUE VINCULO SE OBSTR-
INXERINT, possit per Judicem
competentem, de Hæreticâ pravi-
tate inquiri. &c. Concil. Con-
stantiens. Sess. 19.

(l) Consil. Constant. Sess.
21. damnatio Hærethymy Pra-
gensis Sess. 45. damnatio Jo-
han. Hus.

(1) OMNES & singulos
 Hæreticos, nec non eorum secta-
 tores utriusque sexus; & etiam
 defendentes eosdem, vel ipsis
 quomodolibet, publice vel oc-
 cultè participantibus; etiamsi
 REGALI, REGINALI, DU-
 CALI aut aliâ QUAVIS
 DIGNITATE Ecclesiasticâ
 aut mundana præfulgeant;
 per Excommunicationis, & PRI-
 VATIONIS bonorum ac digni-
 tatum secularium, & alias po-
 nant etiam per captiones & IN-
 CARCERATIONES punian-
 tur. Concil. Constantin. Sess.
 45.

and *John Hus*, notwithstanding the Emperors Safe Conduct, without which they would not have come to that Council. To which we may add, that those *Fathers of Constance* (it will highly concern Protestant Princes to consider it) Synodically define, and declare; That all *Heretiques*, (that is all they call (and commonly miscall Heretiques) all their *defensors*, or *favourers*, &c. of what *dignity* soever, (1) (*Kings*, *Queens*, and *Dukes*, &c.) shall be Excommunicated and deprived of all their Goods, and Secular Dignities. This (*in The-
 si*) is their *impious Doctrine* and Principle; and (*in Praxi*) they are now endeavouring to put it in Execution here in *England*; as evidently appears by their Popish and Hellish Conspiracy, by the Gracious and Powerful Providence of Heaven, lately and happily discovered. I take it then to be evident, that the aforesaid Popish Doctrines and Principles are exceeding dangerous, and to all Supreme Powers (especially Protestant Kings and Princes) pernicious.

2. And from the Premises, it will as evidently follow, that the aforesaid Popish Principles, are not the private opinions of some particular persons onely: seeing, 1. They are profess'd and vindicated by the Jesuites, Canonists, and generally by other great Writers of that Church, in their Books publish'd with the approbation and commendation of Authority. 2. Establish'd in

in their approved and received Canon-Law. 3. In the *Authentic Decretal Epistles*, and *Papal Constitutions*. 4. In their *General Councils*; those (I mean) which they acknowledge to be General. 5. And (to say no more) all their *Clergy and Ecclesiastiques*, (who have place in those *Councils*) have taken a *Solemn Oath* to maintain all those *Canons*, and *Papal Constitutions*; and this Oath required and taken by the Authority and Command of the (a) *Council of Trent*, and the (b) *Pope*; who is acknowledged to be their (c) *Supreme Judge*, and (since the *Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basil*, declared by *Pope Leo the Tenth*, and his *Literan Council*, (which they account a *General Council*) to be above all *General Councils*: and this Declaration (that all might know it is Law and Obligatory) has lately been (d) *re-ferr'd into the Body of their Canon-Law*. Now these things being undeniably true, that their *Popes and General Councils* (the *Supreme Authority of their Church*) have approved and received the afore said Principles and Positions, and caused their *Ecclesiastiques* solemnly to swear, That they do believe, and will constantly profess them, and (so far as they are able) make all committed to their charge, do so too: it evidently follows, that they are *Roman-Catholic Doctrines*, own'd and approved by their *Church*, and not only by private but particular persons. So that if any (who knows, and has impartially consider'd the Premises) deny it;

(a) Vide Concil. Trident. Sess. 24. Cap. 12. de Reformat. & Annotat. Joh. Sotellii Theologi, & Horatii Luthi, Jurisconsulti, ad caput dictum in Edit. dicti Concilii Antwerp. 1596. aliisque nuperis.

(b) In Bulla Pii Papæ 4. super forma Juramenti professionis Fidei, Romæ 1564.

(c) Concil. Florent. Decreto 4. apud Longum à Coriolano, pag. 886.

(d) Cap. Pastor 1. Extra De Conciliis, in Septimo. And in the same place, Cap. Sicut. 3. and Cap. Benedictus 4. The same Doctrine is confirmed by Pope Pius 4.

it; I shall not call him Impudent, but I may
(and must) say, he has a hard Forehead, and
a little thing will not make him blush.

To conclude; If that Priest, or Popish Gentle-
man, (you mention) who so confidently denies
the Church of Rome to approve such Principles, as
I have laid to her charge; can either shew,

(1.) That I have *misquoted* the Authors and Books
I cite, and that such Passages do not occur in
the places quoted.

2. Or (if they do occur) that I have *mistook*
their meaning.

3. Or (if neither of these can be shown) if he
can make it appear, that the Church of Rome
has (by any publick Act or Declaration) dis-
own'd such pernicious Principles and Positions,
and damn'd them as erroneous, and (what
they really are) impious: I do hereby pro-
mise him, that I will be (what I hope
I never shall be) one of the worst sort of
Christians in the World, I mean a Roman-
Catholique. Farewel.

Your Faithful Friend,

T. L.

